The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLI APRIL 1955 NUMBER 2

THE USEFUL STUDY OF PHONETICS

Lee S. Hultzén

MOST of our colleagues—*our* should be glossed after the fashion of the General Semanticists as including Mr. Parrish and myself and other professed phoneticians, and *colleagues* should be glossed as the non-phoneticians, in the vast and somewhat gerrymandered field of Speech—most of our colleagues seem to look upon phonetics as primarily concerned with pronunciation in the narrower sense. Perhaps because the pages of phonetic transcription by which we are best known show forty or more alphabetic symbols for speech sounds, or what we call segmental units, and only four or five non-alphabetic symbols for nonsegmental features of phrasing and accent, and rarely any symbols for intonation. Actually the more significant work that is going on today is in nonsegmental phonetics, as some evidence of which Trager and Smith's *Outline of English Structure*, 1951, spends more than forty percent of Part I (phonology) on phrasing, juncture, stress, and intonation.[1]

Lee S. Hultzén (Ph.D., Cornell, 1932) is Associate Professor in the Speech Research Laboratory of the Department of Speech at the University of Illinois. *This paper was read during the Convention of the Speech Association of America at a luncheon on December 28, 1954, in honor of Professor Wayland M. Parrish of the University of Illinois, who becomes Professor Emeritus September 1, 1955.*

[1] Studies in Linguistics: Occasional Papers 3 (Norman, Oklahoma, 1951).

It seems highly probable that findings on such matters promise to be much more useful, in a very practical way, for all kinds of Speech than anything new likely to be discovered about pronunciation. I shall restrict my comments to the utility of one trick of intonation in oral interpretation.

Although there had been many earlier descriptive and prescriptive generalizations, one might say that the systematic treatment of English intonation began in 1945, with publications by Kenneth Pike and Rulon Wells.[2] Their systems had in common an implicit and explicit phonemicization of intonational pitch as four levels, Pike symbolizing the levels 4, 3, 2, 1 and Wells 1, 2, 3, 4. The theory behind what I have to say is rather different and not well known, still in a log hut for want of a Mark Hopkins. I do not intend to probe the theory here; I shall only state that it rejects the phonemicization of Pike and Wells, and explain very briefly two details pertinent to the business in hand.

First: Stress and pitch, while acoustically to be differentiated, are to be linguistically treated together. From the

[2] Pike, *Intonation of American English*, University of Michigan Publications, Linguistics, vol. 1 (Ann Arbor, 1945). Wells, "The Pitch Phonemes of English," *Language*, XXI (1945), 27-39.

point of view of the pronouncing dictionary, and accent mark indicates for the syllable so marked not only a stress or loudness which is in contrast to that for unmarked syllables, but also an accent place in the pitch scheme of any intonation with which the lexical item may be uttered. When I use the term ACCENT, I include both stress and appropriate pitch.

Second: Every individual speaker who has not been warped from a state of nature by the pernicious doctrine of variety for the sake of variety turns out his utterance, phrase after phrase, on a limited set of what some of us call CARRIER TUNES.[3] These carrier tunes are strictly his. The melodic form of the tunes, the interrelation of accents and unaccents, is fixed by or manifests his language-dialect and his individuality. The end shapes differ in correlation with the syntactic relation of the phrase to other phrases, and it is these syntactic end shapes that make his repertory of carrier tunes more than one, at least two and possibly three. The carrier tunes appear in unmodified shape only for such phrases as have in them no special significance. If there is in the phrase any special meaning, the carrier tune is modified. Or, to turn the circle, modifications of the carrier tune correlate somehow with special meaning. Hiram Corson put the notion didactically nearly sixty years ago: "There should never be in reading a nonsignificant departure from a pure monotony," where his *monotony* is our *carrier tunes*.[4]

We might examine here some of the tune-meaning correlations which have been published, notably R. Kingdon's admittedly futile specification of sixty meanings for sixty variations in intonation of the phrase "I can't find one," which appeared in *Le Maître Phonétique* in 1939.[5] We save time, however, by agreeing with Mr. Parrish's statement that "Attempts have been made to describe and classify the various types of emphasis [i.e., modification of the carrier tune], but without satisfactory results."[6] We should not expect more of intonation than to point to the specific lexical item in which the special meaning lies and leave it to the lexical item to carry the special meaning. This is in accord with a well-known principle of signaling: any interruption of an established pattern of stimulus is a signal calling attention to whatever there is to attend to at that point.

I use the term LEXICAL ITEM for a word, or an equivalent written as two or more words, that is what Fries calls a part of speech.[7] Perhaps it ought to be emphasized here that the recent findings in structural linguistics, brilliantly clarified in part by Fries in his *Structure of English,* are of tremendous importance to all students of language and cannot be ignored by students of Speech. Fries distinguishes between function words (I prefer Sweet's FORM-WORDS) and parts of speech, but has no covering term for the latter. I should like to formulate the more general dichotomy as STRUCTURE and LEXICON. The structure is order and formal inflections and form-words. The lexicon is the words which are put into places in the structure. This analysis makes it possible to avoid speaking of unimportant words and important words as class designations, or using

[3] Cf. Pike, *Intonation*, p. 108.

[4] *The Voice and Spiritual Education* (New York, 1896), p. 78.

[5] "Intonation Stress Marks for English." Third series, No. 68 (Octobre-Décembre 1939), pp. 60-4.

[6] *Reading Aloud*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1953), p. 36.

[7] C. C. Fries, *Structure of English* (New York, 1952), ch. V, "Parts of Speech"; ch. VI, "Function Words."

such unsatisfactory terms as empty words and content words.[8]

The form-words appear at unaccented positions, for the most part, in the carrier tunes and the lexical items at accented positions, always with the possibility of departure from the carrier tune to point to a particular lexical item as significant in the situation.

If the distinction between intonational pointing and lexical information is valid, then the dual task of interpretation and communication may be somewhat simplified for the reader-aloud. The techniques for communication, i.e., manipulation of the intonation, can be studied in general rather than specifically. It is not a matter of a multitude of phrasal patterns, each to be correlated with a nuance of meaning, but a matter of two or three pattern modifications for pointing. The techniques for interpretation can be directed primarily to discovery of where, in what lexical items, the information lies, without any confusion as to specific kinds of special meaning.

As to techniques of communication, I would here note only that the principal departure from pure monotony is regularly in the lexically accented syllable of the lexical item and consists of a higher-louder accent than what is normal for the position in the carrier tune. Very slight departures are sufficient for pointing if the carrier tune is well established and nonsignificant departures are avoided. The pointing may be intensified, however, by augmentation of the pitch-stress departure and by duration and by a turn of pitch, usually a downglide.

One corollary here: Like structures call for like intonations, including like departures from the carrier tune at corresponding places. This rule applies to contrasts as well as to similitudes. Put the structurally like lexical items into like intonations, and whether you are pointing up a similitude or a contrast will depend on the lexical items.

Before I wind up with a few examples, I must acknowledge endorsement of certain useful techniques of interpretation from that new and most scientific field of linguistic study, information theory. Bits of information are calculated on the basis of what goes into a message and have nothing to do with meaning or with whether or not the hearer reacts properly at the far end of the communication. And there is a bit of information, or more or less than one, only where the sender of the message can exercise a choice as to what goes into it.[9] That is, there is information in a message at any point where the message might be other than as it is.

One might note parenthetically that there is one bit of information in the intonation, in that the accent may be that normal to the carrier tune or something different, although there is no meaning. The information theorists have not, so far is I know, taken intonation into consideration.

Now for the examples. For the sentence "Shall you ride to town today?" cited by Parrish as from John Mason's *Essay on Elocution*, 1748, Mason's interpretations are fairly in the pattern of information in this special sense.[10] *Ride* is a choice where there might be *walk*, *town* where there might be *country*, *today* where there might be *tomorrow*. But Mason's statement that "This question is capable of being taken in four different senses" is of course nonsense. The question cannot exist as real utterance

[8] Cf. Fries, p. 88 fn.

[9] Claude E. Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949), p. 100.

[10] *Reading Aloud*, p. 35.

in vacuo. The questioner knows at the time of formulating the question what he is asking, and what he is asking is something about *riding-walking* or about *town-country* or about *today-tomorrow*. If this set of words and punctuation appears in a passage to be read aloud, the task of the interpreter is to discover what the situation giving rise to the question is and through that what the significant lexical item is. If there is any ambiguity it is in what the passage offers by way of setting, not in the question itself.

My statement that intonation points to lexical items has to be qualified for the rare case where a form-word represents choice, i.e., information. Mason points out for his first variation, "Shall *you* ride to town today?" that *you* is a choice as against *your servant*.

As for communication, the intonation can point to the significant lexical item in which, not in the intonation, the information lies, say *ride* as a choice against all possible alternatives to *ride* in the actual situation.

As an example of like structures, take lines five to seven of Shakespeare's Sonnet 29, "When in disgrace." There is a *crux interpretum* in the word *featured*, which structures like *rich in hope, with friends possessed, art*, and *scope*, all highly desirable attributes.

Wishing me
like to one| |more rich in hope,
Featured| |like him,
like him| |with friends possessed,
Desiring this man's| |art
and that man's| |scope, . . .

The interpreter discovers, with some help from a good dictionary, that in Shakespeare's time *featured* meant "good looking." All he can do for communication is to put the word in a like intonation with the obviously rose-colored words; whether the audience understands or not is another question.

Let us turn finally to the first phrase, the first four words, of Browning's most read poem, "That's my last Duchess." Here we have a structural frame, *That is my* ———, where the blank will be filled by one or more lexical items, the interrelation of which will be shown by their order. It is not impossible that there may be information in *my*, but the probability is very small in the situation in which the one-sided conversation takes place, and we may well pass on to the question of whether *last* or *duchess* is the significant lexical item or both.

The doctrine of new idea-echo is of no use whatever as an interpretative methodology here, for both *last* and *duchess* are new ideas. The suggestion from information theory will provide us with a means not only for determining the interpretation but also for demonstrating its validity. Here we have to develop a bit further the notion of choice as the index of information. The speaker has, in a way, no choice: the immediate situation dictates the wording of the message. In the total situation, however, something other than *last* might appear before *duchess*, whereas nothing except *duchess* could appear after *last*. That is, the duke might talk about the next duchess, and does so after she is introduced in the word *dowry*, verse 51, so that there is something like one bit of information in *last*. But the probability of his talking to the count's emissary about anything that is last-next except duchesses is so remote that there is almost no information in *duchess*. The significant departure from the carrier tune must come at *last*. It makes practically no difference whether *last* is raised or lowered out of

the carrier tune; it only intensifies the pointing if a raised or lowered *last* has also increased duration and a glide.

Neither this interpretative method nor the intonational pointing solves all problems. Here the duke and the emissary and the reader all know the total situation, but an audience having no preknowledge of the approaching nuptials, if such an audience could be found, may not immediately know why *last* is significant, and may, if not warned that a duke is talking, have to be informed of that fact through the word *duchess*. Even so, the message information is in *last*, and the intonation can do no more than say that that is where the information is.

READING AT SCHOOL

When I was a small boy, at school, sixty years ago, all the scholars had to read aloud twice a day; the several classes standing while they read, and toeing a chalk line. The books used were the New Testament and Lindley Murray's English Reader. The standard instruction imparted was very limited, but very good as far as it went, namely, "Speak distinctly and mind your stops." Each boy read, at a time, but a single verse of the New Testament, or a single paragraph of the English Reader; the "master" himself first reading a verse, or a paragraph, each time the reading went around the class.

Well, the result was that all the boys acquired at least a distinct articulation and a fluent utterance, properly sectioned off by their minding the stops. Some of the boys, of whom I was one, had to read aloud, at home, from other books. When I showed by my expression, or, rather, by my want of it, that I did not understand what I was reading, I had to read it again, to show that I had caught the meaning and the proper expression. If I were required to read something which was entirely new to me, my eye was exercised in running ahead of my voice, and taking in what was coming, to the extent of a sentence or two, in order to read with sufficient expression not to be stopped, as I was very impatient of interruption, especially if I particularly enjoyed the subject-matter.

When I look back upon these daily exercises in reading, at school and at home, I feel that nothing could have been better at the time. There was no such thing as "speaking a piece," with gesture, "limbs all going like a telegraph in motion," and straining after effect. It was simply careful, honest reading, with no attempt at make-believe of feeling. No encouragement was given to any affectation of that kind; but whatever impressed my listeners as genuine feeling and appreciation on my part, was duly praised; and I was very fond of praise, and was stimulated by it to do my best.

I fear that such reading has very much gone out of use, and that untimely technical instruction has taken its place. Call on a college student to read any prose passage extempore, and what is the result in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred? Why, he will read it, *experto credite*, in a most bungling way, with an imperfect articulation, without any proper grouping or perspective; and if the passage be an involved and long-suspended period, which his eye should run along and grasp as a whole in advance of his voice, he will be lost in it before he gets half way through it. He has had little or no practice in reading aloud. He has "parsed" much in the lower schools, but his parsing has not resulted in synthesis (which should be the sole object of all analysis), has not resulted in a knowledge of language as a living organism, and the consequence is that his extempore vocalization of the passage is more or less chaotic and—afflicting.

Hiram Corson, *The Voice and Spiritual Education* (New York, 1923), pp. 22-26.

THE TEACHER AS READER AND INTERPRETER OF LITERATURE

Marvin T. Herrick

WHEN I was invited to prepare a brief paper for this occasion on the teacher and reading aloud, my first thought was that a teacher should be able to read aloud. At the moment, in fact, reading aloud seemed to be an accomplishment that one might take for granted. Therefore, why say more?

It seemed to me, as I began to recall my own teachers throughout grade school and high school, that all of them were competent readers who read a good deal to their classes. Two of them were memorable readers: one a tall, awkward old maid, who taught English in the high school and was a devotee of the drama; another a young Irish woman named Miss Terry, who taught in the grammar school and who must have been a superlative reader.

I can still remember a morning hour in freshman high-school English. One of my shiftless classmates was slowly strangling Mark Antony's celebrated speech to the Roman mob. The class was bored and irritated. Finally the teacher could stand no more. She strode across the room, snatched the book, waved the boy to go to his seat, turned to the class, and began to read. I cannot speak for the whole class, but for me the next five minutes were my initiation into Shakespeare.

Even more impressive were the performances of Miss Terry, who frequently rewarded her seventh grade with twenty minutes or half an hour of reading aloud. If we were well behaved and industrious, as we generally were, for she was a resolute drill sergeant, we could look forward to 3 o'clock, when all work stopped and she opened the drawer of her desk and took out a book. I shall never forget one autumn afternoon, when Miss Terry announced shortly after lunch that she would read to us until school let out. We must have been unusually diligent that morning. It may well have been the morning when we all wrote, and passed, in 45 minutes a three-hour State-Regents examination in geography. (Miss Terry and other teachers in New York State were fond of such exercises.) At all events, on that memorable afternoon she finished *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*. No speaker or reader ever had a more attentive or appreciative audience. There was not a wriggle from the dullest boy, not a giggle from the silliest girl. To this day, and that was over forty years ago, I have not dared to reopen John Fox Jr.'s masterpiece. It may not be great literature, but on that afternoon it spoke to every boy and girl in the room.

Perhaps I was lucky as a schoolboy, or perhaps school teachers of forty years ago in New York State could actually read aloud. Anyway, my attitude as I approached the preparation of this paper was somewhat naive. Of course I was aware that undergraduates, and some graduate students, too, do not read well today. I certainly was aware that many

Marvin T. Herrick (Ph.D., Cornell, 1925) is Professor of English at Illinois. He presented this paper during the Convention of the Speech Association of America at a luncheon on December 28, 1954, in honor of Professor Wayland M. Parrish.

of them cannot write. But undergraduate classes of forty or fifty or more scarcely allow any opportunity to test the individual's ability or lack of ability in reading aloud. As I began poking about in the current professional literature on reading in our schools and colleges, I met a dismal chorus of complaints. Students nowadays, it seems, cannot read, either silently or aloud, and they are failing in history and science, as well as in literature, because they cannot read. Statisticians have been collecting the most appalling figures to demonstrate that many college students can read no better than a seventh-grader. (Nor do these statisticians have in mind a seventh grade comparable to Miss Terry's.) One expert, a psychologist, has estimated that one month's training of two hours a day in reading for every "literate American" over fifteen would save time, at the modest computation of 50 cents an hour, worth five billion dollars.[1]

That did it. No more statistics were necessary, and I searched no more. Instead, I very sensibly borrowed a copy of Professor Parrish's book, *Reading Aloud*, and read it.

To say I was pleased with the book is an understatement. It seemed to me eminently sound. I had not read beyond the first chapter before I found a good reason why it is sound; the author has followed the soundest tradition in education that our civilization possesses, the tradition that runs from Plato and Aristotle through Cicero and Quintilian to Erasmus, Vives, Melanchthon, Milton, Whately, J. A. Winans, Lane Cooper, and A. M. Drummond. Professor Parrish puts first things first. His fundamental position is that all reading depends upon understanding, upon grasping the meaning of the word, the phrase, the sentence, and the whole composition. In his own words, the goal of reading aloud is the "development of adequate mental and emotional responsiveness to the meaning of literature, and the power . . . to communicate this appreciation to others." To this aim "all else is subsidiary."[2]

The ablest teachers from Socrates onward have taught the same procedure, although they may have used somewhat different terms. Cicero, like Demosthenes, knew how important delivery is to the accomplished speaker. He also knew that artful modulations of the voice and forceful gestures should be an outgrowth from the meaning of the discourse. The action of voice and hand should follow the word: "All the powers of action proceed from the mind."[3] Quintilian had only one precept for reading: the boy must "understand" what he reads.[4] The schoolmasters of the Renaissance, who inherited the teachings of the ancients, knew that after grammar came logic, and only after logic came rhetoric. Thus Melanchthon wrote his rhetoric to supplement his logic. In the rhetorical system of Vives, the dialectic of Aristotle came first. William Kemp, master of a grammar school at Plymouth during the 1580's and 1590's, remarked: "First the scholar shall learn the precepts concerning the divers sorts of arguments in the first part of Logic, for that without them Rhetoric cannot be well understood."[5] Thomas Sheridan in the eighteenth century, whose chief emphasis was upon the mechanics of reading, took for granted that understanding came first. His shrewd comment on the

[1] See Jacob H. Wise, J. E. Congleton, and Alton C. Morris, *Exercise Manual for the Meaning in Reading*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1953), p. v.

[2] *Reading Aloud*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1941), p. 5.

[3] *De Oratore*, 3.59.

[4] *Institutio Oratoria*, 1.8.2.

[5] Quoted by T. W. Baldwin in *William Shakspere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* (Urbana, 1944), II, 1.

poor reading of many schoolboys was at least a negative support of the right tradition. The main reason for this poor reading, he declared, was that "children are taught to read sentences which they do not understand."[6]

In other words, Professor Parrish is in good company, the right company. As far back as we can conveniently go in the records of English-speaking people, we find the best men operating in this same tradition. If we go back to the father of modern English poetry, for example, to one of the most sensible men who ever spoke and wrote our language, we shall find the same right answers. All of you probably remember the following couplet from the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales:*

> A Clerk ther was of Oxenford also,
> That unto logyk hadde longe ygo.

Perhaps you recall the clerk's tale of patient Griselda, the finest demonstration of rhetoric in the whole Canterbury canon. The pilgrims knew that they were listening to an admirable discourse, too. The host, Harry Bailey, a good judge of rhetoric, was wholly delighted. I would rather, he cried, have had my wife hear this tale than have a barrel of ale. And it was not the colors of rhetoric that pleased the host, for before the clerk started to speak Harry had warned him to avoid the high style, to keep his terms, his colors, and his figures for another occasion:

> Speketh so pleyn at this tyme, we yow preye,
> That we may understonde what ye seye.

While the host must have admired the clerk's delivery, for the young man spoke beautifully, what he relished most was the scholar's annihilation of the Wife of Bath's feminist propaganda. Of course Chaucer's clerk was a fine rhetorician, for he was first of all a master of logic.

Logical analysis of content, understanding of the meaning, is not enough, to be sure. No one ever became a good reader and interpreter of literature by devoting himself exclusively to the study of logic. All of these authorities I have cited, including Professor Parrish, have understood the problem. They have known that there is technique as well as understanding, and that this technique should be studied and mastered as far as possible. James Cleland, a royal tutor, who published a book on the education of a young nobleman in 1607, offered the following pertinent advice:

> Wherefore if Nature have denied you a tunable accent, study to amend it by art the best ye may; and to put a distinction between your discourses and a Scythian's, a Barbarian's, or a Goth's. For it is a pity when a nobleman is better distinguished from a clown by his golden laces than by his good language.[7]

Professor Parrish also believes that the student, and the teacher, should study to amend his delivery, but he has always encouraged insight rather than expression. He has always stood firm against any unwitting application of the latest fad of self-expression.

If we can believe the reports of the professional investigators, and the evidence of our own eyes and ears, reading aloud nowadays is in danger of becoming a lost art. There are probably many reasons for this decline, and one of them is surely the constant meddling with the curriculum in schools and colleges, a meddling that dissipates the energy of both teacher and pupil in busy-work. It seems that we are losing contact with the great tradition I have been speaking of. Many teachers have already lost it, or never had it. So far as I can discover, most of our efforts nowadays to recover

[6] *Lectures on the Art of Reading* (London, 1775), I, 155.

[7] *The Institution of a Young Noble Man* (Oxford, 1607), p. 186.

the right track are directed towards repairing what is irreparably damaged. Members of the faculty nowadays are asked to send poor readers and writers to personnel bureaus, psychological clinics, and laboratories of remedial reading. The best of these remedies, however, can only result in patchwork and patchwork is never so good as the product that is turned out right in the first place.

While this patchwork may be better than nothing, it is not the right answer. Tomorrow's school teachers must come from our present undergraduates, most of whom cannot read well, some of whom can read no better than a seventh-grader. There is evidence that the present generation of school teachers does not or cannot read aloud. One of my contemporaries, who teaches in a village school near Champaign-Urbana, tells me that she is the only teacher there who ever reads poetry to her classes. The present low state of reading in our schools appears to be worse than the proverbial vicious circle. If our present undergraduates, many of them, can read no better than seventh-graders, what kind of instruction will they offer their seventh-graders, and what will their seventh-graders be when they in turn become undergraduates and then teachers?

Professor George F. Reynolds has recently objected to the current fetish of trying to increase the speed of reading as a cure-all for the backward student: "Until this emphasis [upon rapid silent reading from the grades up] is changed, there is little hope of teaching the majority of students to read aloud."[8] Professor Reynolds proposes the establishment of serious training in oral interpretation for all graduate students of English. I agree with Professor Reynolds on two counts: on the soundness of his proposal, and on his expectation that our graduate schools will do nothing about it.

Max Parrish, however, has done something about it; he has been doing something about it for a long time. Some of his students, including at least a few of the good ones, must have become teachers of speech and literature, who, in turn, must be giving the right kind of instruction to their students. Professor Parrish himself has correctly defined the importance of the work he has devoted a lifetime to. He has called attention to the benefits that the ability to read aloud may bring to every person in both private and public life. He has singled out the teacher of literature in particular:

> Especially should the teacher of English literature be a good reader, for upon her interpretations will depend largely the taste for poetry of her pupils. Her example, in voice, in pronunciation, in melody, in feeling, in appreciation, will make or mar their taste for fine speech and fine literature.[9]

Among the friends gathered here today to honor Max Parrish, it is my privilege to call attention to the principal task of his long and honorable career, and I wish to congratulate him for having had the good judgment to choose a task so important and so worthy of the best efforts of the teacher. I hope, as we all hope, that his younger colleagues and disciples will carry on this important work as sensibly and as devotedly as he has.

[8] See "Oral Interpretation as Graduate Work in English," in *College English*, XI (1950), 204-10.

[9] *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

RHETORIC AS A HUMANE STUDY

Everett Hunt

THE case for rhetoric as a humane study may be stated with deceptive simplicity. Rhetoric is the study of men persuading men to make free choices. It may well be regarded as the oldest and most central of humane studies. Man's first great free choice was to sin by eating the apple. The first persuader was the devil, and there are many who feel that there always has been and always will be something devilish about persuasion. That first decision has often been referred to as the victory of passion over reason, or as the result of an over-ambitious refusal to be content with the estate wherein man found himself. The long history of the arguments about the nature and effects of this first decision shows how many human qualities are involved in the discussion of any choice.

In fact, the definition of a humanistic study that I present as basic to this discussion is that the "humanities" embrace whatever contributes to freedom in making enlightened choices. An enlightened choice is a choice based upon a wide knowledge of all the alternatives, but knowledge about the alternatives is not enough. There must be imagination to envisage all the possibilities, and sympathy to make some of the options appeal to the emotions and powers of the will. Such dignity as man may have is achieved by the exercise of free choice through the qualities of learning, imagination, and sympathy; and we should add to these qualities as a fitting accompaniment, what may be called civility.

These qualities are sometimes recognized more readily by considering their opposites. The man who lacks learning is often narrow-minded, ignorant, and dogmatic; the man who lacks imagination is literal-minded and pedantic; the man who lacks sympathy is self-centered, opportunistic, and insensitive; if he lacks dignity and civility he may be base, boorish, brutal, or merely trivial and snobbish. The exercise of free choices through an imaginative and sympathetic learning and a dignified civility, then, is the mark of the liberally educated, humane man.

Applying this to a study of rhetoric, we go back to the old debate between Plato and Isocrates. Plato believed that a man should search for a reality above and beyond the vain shows of this world; and he thought that it could be found through mathematics and philosophy. Conformity to the ways of the world was mere sophistry. Isocrates, on the other hand, defined the liberally educated man as one who, in an uncertain situation, could make the best guess as to what he ought to do next. Making these guesses upon the basis of whatever learning, imagination, and sympathy he could command, and strengthening all these qualifications by attempting to make himself and his conclusions acceptable to others, he might well acquire dignity and civility and become a persuasive man, a rhetorician, in the best ancient sense of that now debased word. He would become acquainted in a general way with those persistent questions

Everett Hunt is Dean of Swarthmore College and past editor (1927-1929) of the QJS. *This paper was presented during the Convention of the Speech Association of America at a luncheon on December 28, 1954, in honor of Professor Wayland M. Parrish.*

about which generations of men continually debate, he would know the characteristics of different types of audiences, what kind of ends, aims, and values would appeal to them, and without necessarily attempting to be all things to all men, would both consciously and unconsciously attempt to commend himself as a personally trustworthy agent of the policy he was supporting.

Now there is a large measure of identity between this ideal of Isocrates, and the modern ideal of the humane man, which I have taken largely from a contemporary philosopher, Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard.[1]

But what happens when this integrated and understandable ideal is presented for recognition amidst the curricular and administrative machinery of departments and divisions—of deans and presidents?

In an age of specialization this conception of rhetoric seems almost primitively simple-minded. It is as if one went up to a psychiatrist and said, "Sir, do you believe that he that controlleth his spirit is mightier than he that taketh a city?" The reply would probably be, "Man, do you realize all the implications of what you are saying?"

Or if you went to a philosopher in agony of spirit and said, "Tell me what I ought to do," you would hear him reply, "First let us decide what it means to ask, What ought I to do? Who are you, and how did you get your concept of self? What do you mean by *ought* and where did you get your sense of duty?"

This academic necessity of dealing analytically and semantically with all questions makes it difficult to talk to the lay mind, to the man in the street, without seeming hopelessly naive and superficial. One answer, of course, has been to think with the learned and talk with the vulgar, but the success of academic specialists in writing and talking to the general public suggests that talking with the vulgar may be a more difficult achievement than thinking with the learned.

If academic men could talk with the vulgar, under the terms of the definition of the humanities that I have offered, it ought to be possible for all subjects in the curriculum to contribute to the making of free and enlightened choices.

Natural science can reveal the world around us as the source and environment of human life, and enable us to make our choices of the ends of action with a recognition of our qualities as children of nature, and with admiration for the human qualities displayed in the disinterested pursuit of truth. But science is perpetually being dehumanized by its quite necessary concern with technology.

The social sciences were once concerned with the good life, with the appraisal of purposes for which social institutions exist, but now they identify themselves more and more with the development of scientific technique. A colleague of mine, Professor J. M. Moore, recently spent a semester traveling among colleges and discussing concern with values; and he found that many social scientists in talking of this, repudiated any responsibility for value, although in arguments he did occasionally convict them of having a social conscience.

History and philosophy, which now appear at times as social sciences and now as humanities, often seem definitely to repudiate the humanistic ideal. Where history might humanize a man by leading him to participate imaginatively in the life of the past, it often be-

[1] Ralph Barton Perry, "A Definition of the Humanities," in *The Meaning of the Humanities*, ed. Theodore M. Greene (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938).

comes absorbed in the techniques of fact-finding, with statistics and cycles. Philosophy, which can fertilize thought and strengthen the will by criticizing the ultimate principles of thought and action, seems more and more to abandon the classical problems as insoluble and to devote itself to semantics.

Literature is most commonly allowed to deserve the title of "the humanities," because, as Professor Perry has remarked, literature and the arts seem to be the studies which inhumane teachers are least able to dehumanize. In courses on Sophocles, Dante, and Shakespeare, it is difficult to counteract wholly the influence of Sophocles, Dante, and Shakespeare. Literature presents experience concretely and simply, not as abstracted by scientists and philosophers. But the critics of literature, writing for each other, seem to relegate literature to the simple-minded. Only the other day I heard a scholar state that the criticism of Hamlet had progressed beyond the point where it could be treated in any essay for the general reader.

Rhetoric has certainly not been immune from the dehumanizing influences of technology, and some of the most eloquent passages of Longinus were written in protest against the absorption of rhetoric with technique. Now we are faced with a scientific development of rhetoric under the heading of communication. It seems a little paradoxical, but typical of our age, that the most vigorous claims for the fundamental importance of communication should come from those concerned with development of communicating machines. Norbert Wiener, in *The Human Use of Human Beings,* makes clear the central place of communication in the history of science, and writes that communication and control belong to the essence of man's inner life, even as they are of the essence of his life in society. Wiener is fully aware of the human possibilities and human dangers of the new technology. But in many of the books on communication the development of techniques seems all out of proportion to the results—as, for instance, an elaborate series of experiments to show that obsessional neuroses make persuasion more difficult, or that persons who have established a high degree of credibility are more persuasive than those with a low degree of credibility.

I am sure all these technical studies in the psychology of persuasion are going to expand enormously, and they will eventually prove useful in statistical estimates of the effectiveness of mass media of communication; but they seem to me to contribute little to individual understanding. It is difficult for me to believe that a person receiving a specialized training in these procedures would ever be much more than a statistical calculator of tests and measurements. I am reminded of George Kennan's recent Princeton address on training for statesmanship, when he said that graduate departments of political science had replaced human significance with technicalities, but that it was really more important to read the Bible and Plutarch than to learn all the tricks. The study of Lincoln's First Inaugural as published in *American Speeches* by Parrish and Hochmuth seems to me to typify the very best tradition of rhetoric as humane letters. It presents concretely, with literary skill, the historical background of tension and excitement in which a noble character appeals to people to make a choice which will elevate them as a nation. It is difficult to read such a chapter without being moved and inspired, and without having one's own style improved by unconscious emulation. This kind of study seems to me what we most need in the field of

rhetoric to make clear our significance as one of the humanities.

This paper may sound a little like the petulant complaint of one who fears that he is defending a lost cause, but I have no desire to scold all intellectual workers into conformity with the conception of humanism here set forth. We can no more all be "humanists" than we could all agree to contemplate timeless beauty together without eternal boredom. The quantitative, the technical, the utilitarian, are the raw stuff of life, from which the human must be extracted by processes of interpretation. Their ever-expanding development leads to a continuous demand, even from the technologists, for human reinterpretation, and more insights may come from the studies of new examples of men persuading men to make free choices, than from too rigid a concentration on the examples whose human values have been long established.

We are met here to honor Max Parrish, whose work rightfully belongs to the central humanistic traditions of liberal education, and we honor ourselves, I think, in expressing our gratitude and admiration for his devotion and achievement, and for his understanding of rhetoric as a humane study.

THE STUDY OF ANECDOTES OF ELOQUENCE

I do not know any kind of history, except the event of a battle, to which people listen with more interest than to any anecdote of eloquence; and the wise think it better than a battle. It is a triumph of pure power, and it has a beautiful and prodigious surprise in it. For all can see and understand the means by which a battle is gained: they count the armies, they see the cannon, the musketry, the cavalry, and the character and advantages of the ground, so that the result is often predicted by the observer with great certainty before the charge is sounded. Not so in a court of law, or in a legislature. Who knows before the debate begins what the preparation, or what the means are of the combatants? The facts, the reasons, the logic,—above all, the flame of passion and the continuous energy of will which is presently to be let loose on this bench of judges, or on this miscellaneous assembly gathered from the streets,—all are invisible and unknown. Indeed, much power is to be exhibited which is not yet called into existence, but is to be suggested on the spot by the unexpected turn things may take,—at the appearance of new evidence, or by this exhibition of an unlooked-for bias in the judges or in the audience. It is eminently the art which only flourishes in free countries. It is an old proverb that "Every people has its prophet"; and every class of the people has. Our community runs through a long scale of mental power, from the highest refinement to the borders of savage ignorance and rudeness. There are not only the wants of the intellectual and learned and poetic men and women to be met, but also the vast interests of property, public and private, of mining, of manufactures, of trade, of railroads, etc. These must have their advocates of each improvement and each interest. Then the political questions, which agitate millions, find or form a class of men by nature and habit fit to discuss and deal with these measures, and make them intelligible and acceptable to the electors. So of education, of art, of philanthropy.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Eloquence," in *The Complete Works* (Boston and New York, 1904), VIII, 111-12.

SPEECH IN THE BUILDING OF A MODERN STATE

Laura Crowell

I

ON the Gulf of Guinea in West Africa between the Ivory Coast and Togoland lies the small country known as the Gold Coast. As early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries traders from many nations were attracted by the gold in the sands of its rivers, and its inhabitants came under the influence of Portugal, Holland, and Britain, in succession. The slave trade was abolished in 1807, and Britain extended her interests in the Gold Coast, gradually coming to agreement with the tribal chiefs. When in 1898 the natives took up the cultivation of cocoa, a newly-introduced crop, an era of development began in education, sanitation, and the standard of living in general. More recently, Britain's adoption of the policy of "creative abdication" has opened the Gold Coast to political development.

The ensuing swift advance of that country toward self-government is one of the most compelling stories of the mid-twentieth century. This small rich region—about the size of the State of Oregon—has elected a negro prime minister and a negro legislative house,[1] who have taken on the momentous task of building a modern state from four and one-half million people, ninety per cent of whom are illiterate.

Strength is afforded these builders in their undertaking by the wide dispersion of small family holdings of cocoa-producing lands, by a relatively high standard of living, by the large number of young leaders in government and industry who are educated in British and American schools, and by a population homogeneous in spite of the many tribes and dialects.

Difficult, in addition to illiteracy and ignorance, are such problems as the persisting belief in magic and the delicate adjustments necessary in substituting elected government officials for the customary system of chieftaincy. Some observers regard as inherently dangerous the failure to establish a strong opposition to the Convention Peoples Party, which came to power overwhelmingly in 1951. Fears that the Convention Peoples Party would scrap the Coussey Committee Constitution, which they had opposed, have not been realized, however; indeed, the assumption of responsibility seems to have sobered the party leaders.

The young Prime Minister, Kwame Nkrumah, college-trained in the United States[2] and law-trained in England, was released by the British from imprisonment for seditious acts when his party swept into power in February of 1951. His rise to the position of Leader of

Laura Crowell (Ph.D., State University of Iowa, 1948) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington and a frequent contributor to the QJS.

1 Three ex-officio portfolios are held by British advisers.

2 Nkrumah graduated as Master of Arts and Bachelor of Sacred Theology from Lincoln University in Pennsylvania; see Elspeth Huxley, "An Area of Light in the Dark Continent," *The New York Times Magazine*, January 11, 1953, 20. He did graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania; see Oden and Olivia Meeker, "Letter from the Gold Coast," *The New Yorker*, XXVIII (December 20, 1952), 76.

Government Business and then of Prime Minister—a position never before held in British colonial territory by an elected negro—was accomplished by Nkrumah's grasp of political dynamics but especially by his eloquence, which "touched the hopes of all sorts of people."[3]

In a country that is driving mightily toward literacy with mass education programs, toward agricultural welfare with a concentrated attack on the tsetse fly in the Northern Territories and the mealybug in the vast cocoa areas, and toward industrialization with a large-scale development of bauxite and hydroelectric power, the most significant event of 1953 was Nkrumah's "patriots and gentlemen" speech.[4]

Addressing the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly in July, Nkrumah asked the British Government to declare its readiness to recognize the Gold Coast's claim to self-government.[5] He declared the "readiness [of his people] to assume the responsibility of ruling themselves," and quoted Burke in urging his countrymen to ". . . bring the dispositions that are lovely in private life into the service and conduct of the commonwealth, so to be patriots as not to forget we are gentlemen."[6] His speech showed much good will for Britain,[7] as did the debate which followed.

Nkrumah was "chaired" by his enthusiastic supporters, and the following morning hundreds of people queued up to buy copies of the previous day's proceedings. The speech and debate received world-wide attention; and at the October assembly of the House of Commons the British Government accepted with slight change the proposals for interim arrangements during constitutional alterations in the Gold Coast.[8]

In this great drive for dominion status, the government and the country are putting their faith in education as the "magic key" to modernization. Not only are many students trained in Britain—about 600 go each year—and in the United States, but there is great development in the schools and colleges within the Gold Coast itself.

A gigantic educational effort, moreover, is being made from one boundary of the country to another through governmental and voluntary agencies. When it was necessary to inform the illiterate masses how to register in 1950 for the first general elections, fifteen mobile vans equipped with loud speakers, movie films, pamphlets in eight languages, and musical recordings spent

[3] Cecil Northcott, "Africa's New Democracy," *The Christian Century*, LXVIII (October 31, 1951), 1250. Nkrumah has been termed a "spell-binder" in "Sunrise in the Gold Coast," *Time*, LXI (February 9, 1953), 26. John Carr-Gregg, news editor of British Information Services in New York City, has characterized Nkrumah as "a lively and compelling public speaker who knows how to sway an African audience," and has suggested that his influence "may one day be as powerful in Africa as that of Jawaharlal Nehru in modern Asia"; see "Building Democracies in Africa," *Survey*, LXXXVII (October 1951), 424. Nkrumah has been described by Elspeth Huxley *(loc. cit.)* as having a "messianic manner and an excellent command of English," and in the article, "British Colonial Policy," *The Nation*, CLXXII (March 3, 1951), 194, as having "demagogic tendencies."

[4] "West Africa's Year in Pictures," *West African Review*, XXIV (December 1953), 1241.

[5] "In Accra most of the residents are literate, and even the fishermen and the surfboatmen read the papers. . . . Self-government figures so prominently in the local news that it has been compressed to 'SG' in headlines." Oden and Olivia Meeker, p. 79. Accra is the capital of the Gold Coast.

[6] "Mr. Nkrumah Moves for Independence," *West African Review*, XXIV (September 1953), 950.

[7] He declared: "Among the colonial peoples is a vast, untapped reservoir of peace and good will to Britain would she but give us a guiding hand in working out our destiny." *The Times* (London), July 11, 1953. Note the use of clichés: the "reservoir," and the "guiding hand." The Africans, coming late to the English heritage, are not sensitive to the triteness of certain metaphors and use them with a freedom which surprises those of us who are warned by longer training. See L. D. Lerner, "The Snare of Cliché," *West African Review*, XXIII (June 1952), 599.

[8] "West Africa's Year in Pictures," *op. cit.*, p. 1244.

six weeks covering 22,000 miles and reaching 1,300 settlements. The success of these efforts may be gauged from the results: whereas it had been estimated that one quarter of a million persons would register, actually over 663,000 did so.[9] And today the Department of Social Welfare, the Information Services of the Gold Coast, the Extra-Mural Department of the University College, and the People's Educational Association have extensive and continuing programs, bringing literacy and improved conditions of living throughout the country.

Social development and literacy must, of course, come to an unlettered, ignorant populace through the medium of oral communication. From the halls of the modern University College on Legon Hill, Achimota, to the shade of the "palaver trees" in the remote villages of the Northern Territories, the people are moving toward a modern state through lectures, demonstrations, discussions, dramatizations, films, and radio programs. Constantly used in combination, these forms of oral communication yet merit individual consideration for their contribution to the over-all objective of modernizing the Gold Coast.

II

Lectures and demonstrations are the heart of the literacy campaigns conducted by the mass education teams of the Department of Social Welfare. For example, in the 1952 program, 161 assistant mass education officers were given a five-month training period in which theoretical studies were combined with practical work in the villages. In this training period methods of preparing lectures and of asking effective questions were discussed, and notes containing helpful hints to lecturers were distributed.

Russell Prosser, Chief Community Development Officer, has written me at length concerning his work with the mass education teams and has sent lecture notes which set forth the teaching techniques employed in all their staff training. The opening sentences of the notes on "The Place of Lecturing" explain his point of view:

> An audience of adults possesses a wealth of experience which can be of the greatest use to the lecturer in teaching his subjects. Of all instructional methods the lecture is perhaps by its nature the least calculated to take advantage of this experience. However, the solution of the instructor's main problems of (A) gaining and keeping the group's interest and (B) ensuring that they understand what is said largely depends on the skill with, and the extent to which he makes use of the group's knowledge and experience of life.

This section of the notes closes with the categorical statement: "If the audience hasn't understood, the lecturer hasn't taught."

Attention is given in the notes to "common lecturing faults arising from the nature of the lecture method":

1. The speaker is usually an "expert" and therefore likely, unless he takes appropriate care, to talk over the heads of his group.
   Note—vet [*sic*] all jargon and technical terms.
2. Aware of the need for correct detail the lecturer usually uses notes, and in consequence often tends to "lean" on them, or even read them, which shakes the confidence of the group and makes for difficult listening.
   Note—use notes writ large which can be quickly, easily consulted.
3. The "expert," pre-occupied with the subject as it exists in his own mind, often gives inadequate consideration to the importance of a clear layout in terms of the audience. Don't teach the subject; Teach the subject in terms of the group.

[9] One hundred educated Africans were specially trained to form the teams to "teach democracy" in this great political education campaign. When a mobile unit reached a village, the leader of the team talked about the mission in the local vernacular, then played a special record explaining the election in simple terms, and finally pointed out the composition of the enlarged Assembly on a chart. The average audience was about 300 persons. Carr-Gregg, p. 423.

The notes also list the qualities which are required of the speaker. In order to be successful, the speaker does the following things:

1. Knows the subject.
   The audience has the right to demand this of a *lecturer.*
2. Is sincere.
   In effect the lecturer must be conveying the feeling that the subject is important to him.
3. Meets the group on their own level.
   The lecturer who is himself interested in the subject is likely to interest others. Equally important is it that in his preparation the lecturer's first question should not be "What do I know of this phase of the subject?", but rather "What does my group know of this phase of the subject?"
4. Gives a clear, coherent plan.
   It is often a help to hand round, or put on the blackboard a brief analysis of the lecture. This not only provides a summary but also enables the members of the group to confirm that they have followed and understood the talk.
5. In voice, stance, and manner does not distract attention.
   Consideration of and for the audience is the lecturer's first duty, not only in planning, but also in delivering the lecture.

The notes divide questions to be employed by the lecturer into two types: "exploratory," which reveal the experience of the group with the subject, and "developing," which stimulate reasoning from given premises. Effective use of questioning is summarized for the mass education staff in the concluding statement:

> An instructor's success depends on the extent to which he gets his group to learn. Learning is stimulated by formulating pertinent questions and reasoning toward adequate answers. The instructor should, therefore, decide what parts of his subject required such a process shall take place if those are to be understood by the particular group he had in mind. [*sic*] He then takes those parts and formulates questions designed to give his group an opportunity to see the relationship between what has already been established and the next point which is necessary to further understanding. In asking these questions the instructor should show his students that he is interested in finding out what they genuinely think of the points he puts to them and that he has confidence in their ability to reason through the subject with him. He will not give them any impression that he is seeking only for certain words and phrases which he has decided for his own purposes are the right ones. In questioning his group in this way the instructor will be stimulating a genuine learning process in their minds and will be aware that his rate of exposition is equal to the optimum speed at which they can follow and understand.[10]

Wide publicity was given the literacy campaign in 1952 through the press, radio, letters to volunteer organizations, and the cinema as distributed by seven mobile vans which toured the regions involved. Then, in May, 7,600 volunteer village leaders had a month of training in the Laubach method—a presentation of audible and visible cues jointly—and in class organization. At the close of their instruction, each of these leaders under the supervision of the assistant mass education officers taught a class of villagers in the vernacular. Approximately 75,000 people registered for this intensive three-months literacy course, and over 18,000 received certificates at its close.[11] It is planned that such a drive be made once a year in each area for four or five years until the villages are literate.

A further purpose of the mass literacy drive is to explain the government's community development plans and to demonstrate what can be done when a community sets to work to improve its physical and cultural standards with help in tools and materials from the government. "Drains, sanitation, health, improved agricultural practices, better housing, better nutrition, better roads, grew out of the discussion groups of the

[10] Mimeographed lecture notes sent to me by Russell Prosser, Chief Community Development Officer, Department of Social Welfare, Gold Coast, April 8, 1954.

[11] *Colonial Reports: Gold Coast, 1952* (London, 1953), pp. 61-62.

literacy campaign."[12] Thus, oral communication is the basis of the community improvement programs.

Another vigorous force for education is the Extra-Mural Department of the University College, whose major work lies in systematic tutorial classes for literates with the hope of providing a "social leaven" for the country. In the academic year of 1952-53, 131 classes—totaling 2,250 students and pursuing subjects from political theory to African music—were conducted by tutors who met the students weekly to present lectures and guide discussions.[13]

Many "schools" held for shorter terms use lecture methods also. For example, the Two-Week Course on Social Development held at points in the Ashanti region in 1950 presented lectures on first aid, on child care, and on the technique of teaching adults to read and write quickly; and it also presented demonstrations of new crafts and hobbies. The theory of discussion group work was "taught and practiced." Again, when the Convention Peoples Party first took the reins of government in 1951, lectures and discussions were important in the conferences held for members of the Legislative Assembly on "Local Government" and on "Parliamentary Institutions and Procedure." In the year 1952-53 eighteen week-end conferences were held on subjects varying from the duties of the chairman and the secretary of a meeting to "The Cold War" and "Language Problems in the Gold Coast."[14]

The annual "New Year School" brings together several hundred students from all parts of the country for ten days of serious study. The registrants are divided into groups, each of which has the opportunity of hearing lectures by specialists on chosen phases of the convention theme.[15] Each group is further subdivided for daily meetings in small study seminars under the guidance of tutors. At the 1954 New Year School one seminar began the analysis of unwritten language and made "preliminary investigation of the techniques of the talking drum as an aid to understanding the prosodic features of the Asante language."[16] The adult education group has a special approach, for it aims to train students as tutors; after hearing daily lectures the students give practice talks which are followed by mutual criticism of the methods used. In the evenings during the School the students organize informal activities, among which are debates and practice sessions in the conduct of meetings.

During the year 1952-53 thirteen courses were held for trade union students; the lectures and study seminars of the annual ten-day Easter School were attended by 120 students representing over twenty-five different unions. During this year also the Extra-Mural Department held two ten-day residential schools at the beginning of the Long Vacation: 160 civil servants attended the lectures and seminars on "Current Problems"; 165 elected and traditional members of local councils studied "Local Government" with speakers and discussion leaders.

One-day schools on a variety of topical questions provide for free discussion of vital controversial issues. They take place in the villages and towns, usually by local request. They are generally held on a Saturday afternoon; two and sometimes three talks are given, usually

[12] "A New Year," *Extension Division Bulletin*, No. 139 (Charlottesville, Virginia, January 1953), unpaged.

[13] *Report of the Department of Extra-Mural Studies* (Accra, 1953), pp. 1, 7, 15.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 28-29.

[15] In 1953 the topic was "Twentieth Century" and in 1954, "Focus on Africa."

[16] *Report of the Department of Extra-Mural Studies*, p. 18.

by different lecturers on related phases of the main theme. Often members of the People's Educational Association who have attended these lectures in English return to their villages to give vernacular talks on the same topics.[17]

Furthermore, oral communication is being used to inform Gold Coast citizens of technical advances.[18] The swollen-shoot disease threatened very seriously the cocoa crop of the Gold Coast; so cinema vans and lecturers visited hundreds of towns and villages with carefully planned publicity on cocoa farming. The Volta hydroelectric and aluminum project involved the fishing grounds and homes of many villagers; so vans and speakers went to the people with information and explanation.[19]

In the more desolate, more backward northern areas, messenger-interpreters explain the news of the Gold Coast government and of the world. Each messenger-interpreter receives the news bulletins from a regional public relations officer and is responsible for a particular area. Gathering the elders and the people of a village about him, like the "Town Crier" of the Britain of two centuries ago, he explains the bulletins and answers the questions of his listeners. Even when this method of disseminating the news was in the experimental stage in 1952, the messenger-interpreters were reaching some 10,000 people a month.[20]

Lectures, demonstrations, news interpretations—these forms of oral communication are putting new tools in the hands of the villagers who are seeking emancipation from illiteracy and ignorance.

III

In the numerous "schools" set up by the Extra-Mural Department, the careful provision for discussion in small seminars has been noted. The discussion method is even more basic in the literacy campaigns and the community development work done through the Department of Social Welfare.

The whole staff of mass education officers who are to work in the literacy drives get careful training in how to teach through discussion. The lecture notes sent me by Russell Prosser explain the discussion method as follows:

> It is neither a conversation, nor a debate, nor even a disputation. This is no new conception; long ago Aristotle drew a distinction between those who discuss in the spirit of competition and "those who discuss things in the spirit of enquiry." Its object is understanding, not victory, its method is co-operation, not competition; it insists on relevance not on fixed rules.

Careful explanation of the structure for a classroom discussion is made; the following stages should be readily identifiable:

(a) The first stage, usually a very brief one, is the clarification of the problem. All members of the group must be made quite clear about the field to be covered. As far as is possible, ambiguities must be removed and obscure expressions clarified. The object of the first stage is to ensure that all members are talking about the same thing.

(b) The second stage, also normally a very brief one, is the phasing of the discussion, [*sic*] In most topics for discussion, systematic exploration of the field is aided

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-31.

[18] "It has been remarked, not without some truth, that in Africa, everything begins with a palaver." "The Chief Believes in Bulldozers," *West African Review*, XXIV (June 1953), 562.

[19] "A scale model of the new harbour . . . drew hundreds of visitors daily, and two Ga-speaking interpreters were kept busy explaining details and answering questions." The exhibition continued for three weeks to familiarize the villagers with the plan. "The Volta River Project," *West African Review*, XXIV (December 1953), 1256-1260.

[20] "Mainly Personal," *West African Review*, XXIII (May 1952), 471. W. E. Hall, Director of Information Services, Gold Coast, stated in a letter to me on April 9, 1954, that the messenger-interpreters are still used in the Northern Territories.

VII

The part played by oral communication in the effort of the Gold Coast to achieve self-government cannot be overestimated. Barriers to progress—illiteracy, unfamiliarity with democratic processes, ignorance of modern standards of health and sanitation—are yielding before the impact of carefully organized oral education. Whether attending brief workshops on special problems or lengthier study programs with Extra-Mural Department tutors or mass education teams, the people of the Gold Coast are being educated and motivated through lectures, discussions, and dramatizations. Letters and lecture notes from Russell Prosser, Chief Community Development Officer, reveal the thoughtful adaptation of these methods to the situation in the Gold Coast. Indeed, his philosophy of communication might be reduced in summary to the following points: that the effective lecture takes thoughtful account of the experience and knowledge of the listeners; that the effective discussion fosters spontaneity of contribution but insists on relevancy; and that the effective dramatization includes elements of the immediate situation. Such principles, widened by application to film and radio, are of utmost importance in the building of the modern Gold Coast.

MR. MADISON'S ORATORY

Mr. Madison was not an orator in the common acceptation of the word; there were no deep tones in his voice; no flashes of a fierce and commanding eye; no elegant gestures to attract the beholder; all was calm, dignified, and convincing. It was the still, small voice, in which the oracles of God were communicated to the prophet. He never talked for the love of display, but simply to communicate his thoughts. He spoke often in debate when earnest in his cause, but was always heard with profound attention; not a word of his speeches were lost. He was so perfectly master of his subject that he had nothing to correct in a retrospective view of it, and was so well understood that he had nothing to explain. His voice was deficient in volume, but it was so well modulated that its compass was more extensive than that of many speakers of stronger lungs.

New-York Mirror, XIV (July 23, 1836), 28.

WHAT IS STYLE IN ACTING?

Garff B. Wilson

AT a recent convention of the Speech Association of America, I attended a program on "Styles of Acting." The program consisted of two demonstrations: in the first, a group of students, properly costumed, performed a scene from a Restoration comedy with an impressive amount of bowing, fan-fluttering, and elegant diction; in the second, another group of students presented a scene from a play by Ibsen in which the action was simple and realistic, the dialogue plain and blunt. Following the demonstrations there was a brief commentary to the effect that we had just witnessed two different styles of acting and it should now be clear to us what is meant by style in acting.

Although the demonstrations were capably presented, the program left me puzzled and unsatisfied. I found myself wondering: is style in acting merely the reproduction of the manners and customs of another period? Is it the same as personal idiosyncrasies? From whence does an actor derive his style? How is it related to innate ability? How is it affected by training and experience? What is the effect of style on achievement in acting? Is there any relationship between the style of a given period and the social and aesthetic standards of the period? Just what *is* style in acting?

It seems to me that the discussions and demonstrations of style presented in recent years have all been limited to one or two aspects of the subject. Either style has been presented as the reproduction of the social manners and customs of a bygone era, or it has been assumed to be the mannerisms and idiosyncrasies of individual performers. While it is true that both these elements of style are pertinent and important, the general problem is far more inclusive and complex. It is my intention to analyze the general problem and attempt to answer the questions which have been bothering me ever since I witnessed the aforementioned demonstrations in styles of acting.

If one had supernatural powers and could summon from the past the great figures of Edwin Forrest and Edwin Booth—if one could place them on the stage beside Laurence Olivier and ask each player to perform an act of *Hamlet*, one would witness three strikingly different portrayals. Forrest, heroically built and endowed with an organ-like voice, would give a strenuous, explosive, muscular performance. Edwin Booth, slender of figure, thoughtful and melancholy of temperament, would give a poetic, graceful, introspective portrayal. Laurence Olivier, moulded by the manners and philosophy of the contemporary stage, would give a quietly intense, subdued, and "natural" performance. A comparison of the three portrayals would reveal what is meant by style in acting: it is the individual characteristics of appearance, voice, movement, and temperament which distinguish one actor from another; or it is the distinctive mode of presentation used by an actor in the performance of a role.

To understand style, it is necessary to

Garff B. Wilson (Ph.D., Cornell, 1940) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of California at Berkeley.

understand what determines it; that is, one must understand the factors which shape the distinctive manner of presentation of any actor. There are at least six of these factors which determine style.

The first factor is the actor's physical endowments. Nature gives him a certain face, figure, and voice, and on these basic endowments he will inevitably build his art. Edwin Forrest, for example, had a massive, muscular physique which gave him the strength and appearance of the Farnese Hercules. He chose roles which suited his physique—like Damon, Metamora, Jack Cade, and Coriolanus—and performed them with intensity and power. Edwin Booth, on the other hand, was graceful, slender, and of average height. He was not physically capable of the strenuous emotional displays of Forrest, so he eschewed them for an intellectual, spiritual quality which earned him praise as "the foremost poet of his profession."[1] That Booth was fully aware of the influence of his physical endowments on his style is revealed when he said: "It is rather safe to assume that actors establish their school upon their physique—for one must cover up what one cannot physically do."[2]

The slight, boyish figure of Maude Adams impelled her to such boyish whimsical roles as Peter Pan and L'Aiglon; the strong, masculine physique of Charlotte Cushman made her an ideal Queen Katherine and (to her contemporaries) an acceptable Romeo; Henry Irving's physical awkwardness forced him to concentrate on intellectual intensity and on eccentricity of gait, movement, and gesture.

Facial characteristics and vocal endowments also influence style. Actors with droll or homely faces often become eccentric comedians so that they can capitalize on their facial peculiarities. Actresses with beautiful faces often rely on external charm alone, and their style remains cold and listless. Charlotte Cushman, who was not endowed with a beautiful face, developed an intense, restless manner of moving about the stage, and when asked to explain it replied that if she were beautiful like Mrs. Siddons she could afford to stand still and be gazed at, but without beauty she had to occupy the eye of the spectator with action and movement or half her influence would be lost.[3]

The influence of Cushman's voice on her style is a further illustration of the effect of physical endowment on an actor's manner of performance. In her youth, Miss Cushman aspired to be a singer but after a successful debut in grand opera she ruined her singing voice by overstraining it in a large theatre. Her speaking voice was left with a husky, hollow quality, "a woody or veiled tone," as James Murdoch described it. This unique quality, plus wide range and unusual power, made Cushman's voice capable of expressing intense, sustained grief without loudness or sudden variations. These vocal characteristics became a noticeable feature of the actress's style, just as the thunderous tones of Forrest or the rich contralto of Mary Anderson identified and influenced their manner of performing.

A second important determinant of style, after physical endowments, is the mental and spiritual endowments of an actor. The player with vivid imagination will act with intensity and insight. The player with a scholarly mind may intellectualize his roles. The actor with

[1] Lewis C. Strang, *Players and Plays of the Last Quarter Century* (Boston, 1903), I, 156.
[2] Katherine Goodale, *Behind the Scenes with Edwin Booth* (Boston & New York, 1931), p. 232.
[3] See Lawrence Barrett, *Charlotte Cushman—A Lecture* (New York: The Dunlap Society, 1889), p. 14.

nervous, high-strung temperament may develop a tense, explosive style of performing. Henry Irving, it is said, could "neither walk nor talk" but achieved success on the stage through "the character and quality of his intellect."[4] Edwin Booth, who possessed a penetrating, poetical mind, endowed his roles with a spiritual quality which was unique. William Winter said, "the distinctive quality that illuminated his acting was the personal one of poetic individuality."[5] In our own time, John Gielgud's keen intellect and emotional sensitivity have helped to mould a style which one imagines is akin to the style of Booth.

A third and exceedingly influential factor in determining style is the manners and customs of the period in which an actor lives. Just as styles of dress change with the years, so do fashions in etiquette and behavior fluctuate. An actor automatically and unconsciously absorbs and incorporates these changing fashions in behavior. Where the Restoration gallant would bow and kiss a lady's hand with (to us) an exaggerated flourish, the modern gentleman will merely smile and give a barely perceptible nod of the head. Where the nineteenth-century heroine would blush and hide her face with a fan, the twentieth-century lady will raise an eyebrow and light a cigarette. In Mrs. Siddon's day a lady cultivated an erect carriage, a graceful walk, and elegance in all her movements. It was very natural, then, for Mrs. Siddons to stand, walk, and move in a stately fashion when she took the stage. Today the fashion in behavior dictates that a lady be casual, nonchalant, athletic—and so an audience shows no surprise when Katharine Cornell slouches across the stage with hands in pockets, or when Katharine Hepburn lolls in a chair with one bare leg over the arm.

The marked difference in social manners and customs from period to period has given rise to the notion, previously mentioned, that style in acting is merely a reflection in the theatre of changes in etiquette and behavior. Thus posture, movement, gestures, as well as the manner of performing stage business, are noticeably different in the production of a Greek play as compared to the same things in a Restoration comedy, or in the production of a nineteenth-century melodrama as compared to a modern murder mystery. Incidentally, one suspects that these differences in posture, movement, gesture, etc., are very imperfect representations of the actual behavior of the periods being imitated; yet the differences convey an impression of "period" and lend an air of historical authenticity to the production. The differences also indicate "style" to the observer, and if he is not careful, he may forget that style is much more than this, including—as I have pointed out—the distinctions of manner which arise from physical and mental endowments as well as from other factors yet to be discussed.

Social manners and customs of a period inevitably influence style and so (a fourth factor) do the aesthetic ideals of a period. The formative effect of an aesthetic milieu is striking and pervasive not only in acting but in all the arts. The eighteenth-century belief in balance, discipline, and good form—based on the ideals of neo-classicism—produced the neat couplets of Alexander Pope, the precise, symmetrical paintings of David, and the restrained, formal music of Handel and Thomas Arne. In the theatre, these ideals produced acting characterized by the acceptance of

[4] Henry Austin Clapp, *Reminiscences of a Dramatic Critic* (Boston & New York, 1902), p. 215.

[5] William Winter, *The Life and Art of Edwin Booth* (New York & London, 1893), p. 223.

traditional rules. A player learned conventionalized tones and gestures from his elders and followed their tradition in the interpretation of a role. Critical judgment assumed that "the closer the imitation of the older actor by the younger, the better was his presentation of the part."[6]

Later in the century, neo-classicism gave way to realism and then to a new theory of art championed by Sir Joshua Reynolds. He affirmed that the purpose of art was not to imitate the literal details of nature but to raise and elevate nature—to exclude the ugly and elevate the ideal. Reynolds' aesthetic beliefs and the paintings he produced to illustrate them greatly influenced other artists and inevitably influenced the fashion in acting. John Philip Kemble and his sister, Sarah Siddons, adopted the Reynolds theory and, combining this influence with other compatible influences, developed a style of acting which substituted "grand" declamation for realistic delivery, and introduced dignity and nobility instead of true-to-life representation.

When nineteenth-century romanticism swept the western world with new aesthetic convictions, all the arts were violently affected. Music, painting, architecture, and literature were revitalized and transformed. Acting, too, was transformed from the grand and elevated style of the Kembles to the fiery emotional school of Edmund Kean. Under the potent force of Kean's example, a new period of tempestuous, passionate acting was inaugurated—a style which paralleled in many respects the romantic style espoused by the other arts.

A fifth factor in the formulation of style in acting is the force of training and experience. The instructors who guide an apprentice actor, and the examples set by fellow players, inevitably exert an influence in developing an actor's style. For example, Edwin Forrest, as a young man, took elocution lessons from Lemuel G. White, and the effect of this instruction was evident years later in the distinctness and precision of Forrest's articulation. Some time later, Edmund Kean visited the United States, and Forrest was engaged to play "seconds" in Kean's troupe; thereafter Forrest changed his style to include the impulsive, fiery, passionate displays which characterized Kean's performances. In our own day, the effect of the Group Theatre's instruction and training can be observed in the style of many actors, and certainly the students of Cornell's great A. M. Drummond can recognize in each other the influence of his unique instruction. A great teacher or a great actor can establish a "school" and affect the style of innumerable followers. This means that the pupils or followers of such a leader will have certain traits in common, but, of course, they will never be identical in the manner of their performances. All the followers of Edmund Kean adopted his practice of impulsive emotional outbursts, and, since they were living in the same social and aesthetic milieu, they resembled him in other ways as well. But because each had unique physical and mental endowments, they never demonstrated identical examples of the "Kean style." Likewise, all the actors included in the Group Theatre shared certain common ideals and ways of doing things, but John Garfield's manner of performance was very far from being identical with the style of Stella Adler or Franchot Tone.

A final factor in the determination of

[6] Lily B. Campbell, "The Rise of a Theory of Stage Presentation in England During the Eighteenth Century," *PMLA*, XXXII (1917), 165.

style is the effect of the role being played. Dramatic literature offers a vast gallery of characters and each one, if effectively presented, will move and speak, act and react, in a different manner. The actor who successfully portrays these characters will change his style with his role. The demands of the part will help to determine the style of the acting. Laurence Olivier, for example, plays Puff in Sheridan's *The Critic* in a different style from that of his portrayal of Oedipus, and both are unlike his portrayal of the Duke in Fry's *Venus Observed*. At this point, one is reminded of the problem of the one-part actor compared to the player who can transform himself with each role. What is the relationship of versatility to style?

The one-part actor, we say, is always himself. He acts each part in the same way and transforms every character he plays into a likeness of himself. This is another way of saying that the actor has a limited, inflexible style. His manner of performance is unvaried. He uses the same walk, gestures, movement, facial expression, and delivery in every role. The versatile actor, on the other hand, changes with the demands of the part. He transforms himself to fit each character being played. The role he enacts causes him to change his style, and if he does this successfully, he can be said to have a flexible, adaptable style.

In the late nineteenth century, Clara Morris won acclaim as an effective emotional actress. She had the unique power of weeping real tears at every performance and was able to wring the hearts of her audience with her tearful portrayal of "soiled doves" in domestic melodramas adapted from the French. But her heroines were always the same, and her manner of portraying them never varied. She had but one style—a crude, emotional exhibitionism—and this eventually bored the public and drove Miss Morris from the stage.

The unusual versatility of the great comedian, William Warren, is a sharp contrast to Miss Morris's inflexibility. During his fifty-one years on the stage, Mr. Warren performed 13,500 times in almost 600 different roles. He portrayed an infinite variety of comic types ranging from broad farce to subtle satire, and each character, when finally presented, was not only distinct and unique but "flawless, living, rounded, and complete."[7] Warren's ability to change his style with each new character enabled him to perform in one city, in one theatre, with one stock company, for thirty-five years—without ever losing a jot of his popularity or appeal.

The actor with a flexible, adaptable style will rarely exhibit those individual mannerisms and personal idiosyncrasies often identified with style. Such mannerisms are, to be sure, one element of style—but by no means the whole of it. Furthermore, they denote an inflexibility which limits the actor and makes him easy to caricature. Katharine Hepburn's flat, light-lipped articulation gives a sameness to every role she plays and is burlesqued by every impersonator, professional or amateur. Likewise, Eddie Bracken's mugging and twitching are repeated in all of his parts and make him an easy subject for caricature. In contrast to these examples is the style of Edwin Booth, which was so flexible and lacking in mannerisms that when Nat Goodwin, who specialized in burlesquing famous people, was asked why he never tried an imitation of Booth, he replied: ". . . what's there to hang a caricature on? His art's round like a

[7] Evelyn G. Sutherland, "William Warren," in McKay & Wingate, *Famous American Actors of Today* (New York, 1896), I, 188.

ball . . . I couldn't be funny caricaturing perfection."[8]

So far I have tried to show that six factors determine the style of an actor:

1. His physical endowments
2. His mental and spiritual endowments
3. The manners and customs of the period in which he lives
4. The aesthetic ideals of the period
5. The training and experience to which he is subject, and
6. The demands of the role he is playing

My discussion of these factors suggests two additional questions which need clarification: What is the relationship of style to ability? And what is the relationship of style to achievement or success in acting? From the foregoing discussion it might be inferred that style and ability are synonymous, or that style is the sole determinant of achievement in acting. Such is not the case.

As I have pointed out, an actor has certain basic endowments of body and voice, mind and spirit. These are the raw materials out of which he shapes his art. Given limited endowments, he will become a limited actor; given great endowments, he may become a great actor. Training and experience will determine how the actor develops his endowments. If he does not train or act at all, he obviously will never become an actor, even though he possesses great natural gifts. If he trains well and acts often, he will become a successful performer, when he possesses sufficient natural endowments. His training and experience, moulding his natural endowments and occurring in a particular social and aesthetic milieu, will develop his style. Style is not the same as natural endowments. It is the manner of using these endowments. Style is not the same as ability. It is the characteristic way of manifesting the ability. Style is not the same as success in performance, but it can aid or hinder success in performance. Training and experience will teach an actor how to use his endowments. The external characteristics of the *way* in which he uses them are his style.

[8] Katherine Goodale, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

A CRACK ANECDOTE

The word *crack*, applied to theatrical performances, and several others of the fine arts, means some particular point which eclipses all the rest. Thus that song in an opera, which always secures the most applause, is called "the crack song of the piece." On the evening that Black Hawk and his party visited Castle Garden, Marsh, the proprietor, had prepared some pieces of fireworks, which were admitted to be unrivalled in the pyrotechnic art. In mentioning this fact, on the following day, to a country gentleman who was lavish in his praises, Marsh observed that he had anticipated their success, as they were all "crack pieces," prepared expressly for the occasion. "Yes, I know," returned the honest countryman, with unaffected simplicity—"I took particular notice that they all *cracked* when they went off."

New-York Mirror, XI (July 13, 1833), 16.

THE LIMITS OF RHETORIC

Maurice Natanson

THERE are signs of a new excitement in the discipline of contemporary rhetoric; but there are also indications of basic difficulties in the discussions going on to determine the proper province of rhetoric and the possible meaning of a "philosophy of rhetoric." As a philosopher, I think that an effort to show the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy might lead to some clarification of the underlying issues. If the philosopher cannot give the answers, he can perhaps clarify the questions.

But first, what do these "difficulties" in the discussions about rhetoric consist in? Undoubtedly one vast difficulty is generated by the very term "rhetoric." As Bryant points out, rhetoric may mean ". . . bombast; high-sounding words without content; oratorical falsification to hide meanings; sophistry, ornamentation and the study of figures of speech . . . and finally, least commonly of all, the whole art of spoken discourse, especially persuasive discourse."[1] The classical Aristotelian definition of rhetoric is no longer adequate to dispel all these variant connotations, but the inadequacy of defining rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" is to be explained at a different, far deeper level. It will be here that we come to the nucleus of the difficulties regarding rhetoric.

It would appear that what characterizes the Aristotelian as well as recent definitions of rhetoric is a stress on its functional and dynamic character. As Bryant writes:

> Rhetoric is primarily concerned with the relations of ideas to the thoughts, feelings, motives, and behavior of men. Rhetoric as distinct from the learnings which it uses is dynamic; it is concerned with movement. It *does* rather than *is*. It is method rather than matter. It is chiefly involved with bringing about a condition, rather than discovering or testing a condition.[2]

Now the emphasis on the directional and pragmatic aspect of rhetoric leads immediately to the question, *Is* rhetoric truly to be characterized as functional, and is the rhetorical function that of "adjusting ideas to people and . . . people to ideas"?[3] The fundamental difficulty, it seems to me, that has confused the discussion is a failure on the part of the analyst to distinguish between the theory of rhetoric and the practice of rhetoric: the former involves ultimately a philosophy of rhetoric; the latter presupposes that philosophy and directs its attention to the structure of rhetorical technique and methodology. But before proceeding to the analysis of these elements, I think it necessary to examine more carefully what is meant by the functional aspect of rhetoric, since my claim is that much confusion is created by assuming this interpretation of the nature of rhetoric.

Maurice Natanson (Ph.D., Nebraska, 1950, D.Sc., Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research, 1953) is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the University of Houston. American Council of Learned Societies Scholar 1951-53, he is the author of A Critique of Jean-Paul Sartre's Ontology *and has contributed articles to philosophical journals.*

[1] Donald C. Bryant, "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," *QJS*, XXXIX (December 1953), 402.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 412; cf. Hoyt H. Hudson, "The Field of Rhetoric," *QJSE*, IX (April 1923), 180, where the essence of rhetoric is held to be "adaptation to the end of influencing hearers."

[3] Bryant, *op. cit.*, p. 413.

It is well known that Aristotle begins his *Rhetoric* by asserting that "Rhetoric is the counterpart of Dialectic." If dialectic is the art of logical discussion, then rhetoric is the art of public speaking; but the distinction between rhetoric and dialectic is a more profound one. Dialectic, for Aristotle, has as its object the achievement of knowledge; rhetoric, persuasion. Dialectic strives for and may achieve *epistēmē;* rhetoric, *doxa.* Thus rhetoric is subordinate in the hierarchy of knowledge to dialectic as belief is subordinate to knowledge. Now if we consider the relationship between the Aristotelian rhetoric and the Platonic critique of rhetoric, it becomes evident that Aristotle has articulated a division between rhetoric and dialectic for definite reasons: essentially, for the rescue of "good" rhetoric from "bad," i.e., from sophistic rhetoric. Good rhetoric, as Plato pointed out in *Phaedrus,* presupposes dialectic: persuasion presupposes truth. The division of rhetoric and dialectic warns us against confounding truth with its artful presentation and at the same time shows that they are separate facets of a single universe of discourse: the intelligible world.[4] But what really separates knowledge from belief, dialectic from rhetoric? It is here that we come to the problem of function.

It is certainly the case that Aristotle, after distinguishing between rhetoric and dialectic, proceeds to analyze the applicative uses of rhetoric. His discussions of the modes of persuasion stress the functional character of rhetorical method. Thus the subject matter of rhetoric becomes evidenced in the problems of speaker and audience, political oratory and its devices, etc. And it is precisely here that the subsequent tradition of rhetoric takes its point of departure and so abandons the awareness of the intimate nexus between rhetoric and dialectic; and it is here that confusions begin to germinate.

For Plato, rhetoric—good rhetoric, that is—aspired to be (but was not) *technē*, i.e., art involving knowledge. While dialectic alone could achieve the status of *theōria*, rhetoric nevertheless had a powerful bond which tied it to knowledge. Though Aristotle's division of rhetoric and dialectic preserves the original intention of that bond, his stress on the subject matter of rhetoric (the modes of persuasion) lends itself to a misleading emphasis on rhetorical technique and to a lack of emphasis on the theoretical aspects of rhetoric. In other words, instead of a philosophy of rhetoric, we have drawn from Aristotle a manual of oratorical technique and a debater's guide. The ultimate import of this attitude towards rhetoric is an interpretation of the nature of rhetoric which holds it to be functional in character, directed toward practical problems of convincing and persuading, and so aimed at a pragmatic, instigative goal: rhetoric is conceived of in terms of men in action.

Now it is the thesis of this paper that this stress on the functional, pragmatic character of rhetoric is the origin of the confusion regarding the role and province of rhetoric today, and further that the confusion consists precisely in the fact that the Platonic and Aristotelian emphasis on the link between dialectic and rhetoric has been ignored in favor of the pragmatic subject matter with the result that the theoretical nature of rhetoric is obscured. It is my contention that a reapproach to the nature of rhetoric is possible through a

[4] Cf. E. M. Cope, *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric* (London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co., 1867), p. 6.

[5] See Werner Jaeger, *Paideia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944), Vol. III, Ch. 8.

philosophical examination of its foundations in dialectic.

The need for re-examination of the nature and scope of rhetoric is voiced in many and diverse quarters today, but the stress on the relationship of philosophy to rhetoric is not a recent development. As a matter of fact, it is Bishop Whately who makes the point in connection with a criticism of Cicero as rhetorician:

> Cicero is hardly to be reckoned among the number [of rhetoricians]; for he delighted so much more in the practice than in the theory of his art, that he is perpetually drawn off from the rigid philosophical analysis of its principles, into discursive declamations, always eloquent indeed, and often interesting, but adverse to regularity of system, and frequently as unsatisfactory to the practical student as to the philosopher.[6]

The rhetorician, then, according to Whately, must attend seriously to the philosophical problems which are at the root of his discipline. With regard to logic, Whately writes: "Rhetoric being in truth an offshoot of Logic, that Rhetorician must labor under great disadvantages who is not only ill acquainted with that system, but also utterly unconscious of his deficiency."[7] Unfortunately, as I. A. Richards points out,[8] Whately does not follow his own advice, with the result that instead of taking "a broad philosophical view of the principles of the Art," Whately gives us "a very ably arranged and discussed collection of prudential Rules about the best sorts of things to say in various argumentative situations, the order in which to bring out your propositions and proofs and examples. . . ."[9] Just as Richards correctly points out Whately's failure to carry out his own directive, so we must also add that Richards fails to carry out a sustained inquiry into the philosophy of rhetoric, though he does develop one subsidiary line of approach, that of the analysis of linguistic structure and meaning. The philosophy of rhetoric remains then an unexamined realm; and it is especially interesting that a volume published in 1953 takes as its theme the relationship between philosophy and rhetoric and seeks a radical reapproach to the ancient dualism of rhetoric and dialectic. We shall take Richard Weaver's *Ethics and Rhetoric*[10] as a point of departure in analyzing the problem before us.

Weaver begins his study of rhetoric by calling us back to the original Aristotelian distinction between rhetoric and dialectic. As we indicated before, rhetoric is concerned with persuasion, dialectic with truth. However, it is necessary to remember that for Aristotle, *both* rhetoric and dialectic are concerned with the world of probability, both begin with the commonsense reality of contingency, not with the realm of apodeictic logic. Aristotle's distinction between scientific knowledge (which includes the organon of deductive logic) and argumentative inquiry (which includes both rhetoric and dialectic) makes clear the difference between the formal deductive syllogism which begins with stipulated premises and arrives then at necessary conclusions and, on the other hand, rhetoric and dialectic, which inquire into the empirical grounds of propositions in an effort to establish the truth and then make clear the available means of its artful presentation.[11] For Aristotle, deductive logic cannot provide any proof of its ultimate premises: such proof is the task

[6] Richard Whately, *Elements of Rhetoric* (New York: Sheldon & Co., 1867), p. 24.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[8] I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 7.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[10] (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1953).

[11] Cf. James H. McBurney, "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory," *SM*, III (1936), 52.

of dialectic.[12] The ultimate foundations of science and formal logic, then, rest on dialectic: logic is concerned with validity, dialectic with truth. Thus Weaver writes: "Dialectic is a method of investigation whose object is the establishment of truth about doubtful propositions."[13]

Now it would appear that there are different fields of study dialectic may pursue: the scientific method of induction in the field of botany is quite different from the endeavor to establish the truth in matters of politics or ethics. Which field of dialectic will rhetoric concern itself with? Weaver holds:

> There is a branch of dialectic which contributes to "choice or avoidance" and it is with this that rhetoric is regularly found joined. Generally speaking, this is a rhetoric involving questions of policy, and the dialectic which precedes it will determine not the application of positive terms but that of terms which are subject to the contingency of evaluation.[14]

The dialectic which seeks to establish terms having to do with policy is in an intimate relationship with rhetoric, for rhetoric is meaningful only if dialectic is presupposed. As Weaver says, "there is . . . no true rhetoric without dialectic, for the dialectic provides that basis of 'high speculation about nature' without which rhetoric in the narrower sense has nothing to work upon."[15] It is this internal connection, rooted in the very nature of rhetoric, that provides Weaver with his *rapprochement* between rhetoric and philosophy.

Weaver's original contribution to the problem is expressed in a particular characterization of dialectic. Turning to a more nearly Platonic than Aristotelian conception of dialectic (though the Neo-Aristotelian overtones are obvious), Weaver interprets dialectic as a distinguishable stage in argumentation: "Dialectic is that stage which defines the subject satisfactorily with regard to the *logos*, or the set of propositions making up some coherent universe of discourse; and we can therefore say that a dialectical position is established when its relation to an opposite has been made clear and it is thus rationally rather than empirically sustained."[16] This view of dialectic as purely conceptual leads to a notion of rhetoric as applicative or practical. Thus for Weaver "the urgency of facts is never a dialectical concern;"[17] "what a successful dialectic secures . . . is not actuality but possibility; and what rhetoric thereafter accomplishes is to take any dialectically secured position . . . and show its relationship to the world of prudential conduct."[18] The relationship between dialectic and rhetoric may now be stated as Weaver understands it.

Rhetoric in the wider sense includes dialectic,[19] in so far as dialectic has already functioned in providing the rhetorician with the truth, or in so far as the application of a dialectically secured position is made to the real world. The action that rhetoric professes presupposes in this sense the understanding that good action always involves. This being so, Weaver's point emerges: the duty of rhetoric in the widest sense is "to bring together action and understanding into a whole that is greater than scientific perception."[20] By itself, then, rhetoric is blind, for it has not truth; concomitantly, an isolated dialectic is empty, for it never engages the issues of the empirical world. Com-

[12] Cf. W. Windelband, *A History of Philosophy* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901), p. 137; also P. Albert Duhamel, "The Function of Rhetoric as Effective Expression," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, X (June 1949), 345.

[13] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

bined, dialectic and rhetoric constitute an instrument for reapproaching the multiple problems of politics, ethics, linguistics, and literary criticism. But in what sense does this union of rhetoric and dialectic provide us with a *rapprochement* between rhetoric and philosophy? At this point we must return to the original problem and see where the argument has led us.

We began, it may be recalled, with the functional stress which is placed on rhetoric today and suggested that much of the confusion regarding the nature and province of rhetoric is due to the divorce between rhetoric and dialectic. Our thesis here converges with that of Weaver, for it is precisely Weaver's point, as we have just seen, that rhetoric must go with dialectic if it is to be meaningful. Now the union of rhetoric with dialectic means, in Weaver's terms, a return of rhetoric to a dialectic understood not as the "art of logical discussion" but in the much broader sense of the conceptual ordering of propositions into coherent structures of an a priori nature. Dialectic in this sense is no longer "argumentative inquiry" but rather, I submit, philosophical inquiry. The unification of rhetoric and dialectic is really the *rapprochement* between philosophy and rhetoric because dialectic is given a unique interpretation: dialectic constitutes the true philosophy of rhetoric.

Understood in this way, the original Platonic and Aristotelian notions of rhetoric and dialectic become clarified: the philosophy of rhetoric achieves the Platonic idea of *technē*, and the Aristotelian idea of dialectic is seen in its most challenging aspect. Rhetoric ceases to be the *technique* of persuasion and truly becomes the *art* it was originally held to be, an art, however, which sustains itself only in and through its involvement with dialectic.

If all this is true, the question naturally arises, What, after all, is the subject matter of the philosophy of rhetoric? Granted the meaningfulness of interpreting rhetoric in this way, what is to be done with the interpretation? Have we invoked Whately's criticism of Cicero, Richards' criticism of Whately, and added our criticism of Richards, only to fall into the same trap ourselves? The unavoidable question is, What problems constitute the subject matter of the philosophy of rhetoric, and how may such a philosophy be articulated? Obviously, we can offer only a fragmentary indication here of the way in which we would approach these problems.

Let us return once again to Aristotle's concept of dialectic. As we noted, dialectic is understood by Aristotle as operating in the realm of probability, not necessity. Dialectic seeks the truth but conducts the search in the midst of the real world of contingency and doubt.[21] Now the new enriched conception of dialectic that we are offering here—dialectic understood as the philosophy of rhetoric—concerns itself not with fact but with the theoretical structure that is logically prior to fact. How is such an a priori system related to the contingent world? The question then is, What is the relationship of dialectical theory to rhetorical fact? Stated in still another way, the question is, What is the relationship of theory to practice? All of these questions are transpositions of our fundamental problem: the true province of rhetoric. The answer to these questions and the exploration of the fundamental problem lead necessarily to the nature of philosophy itself. To answer the question, What is the subject matter of the

[21] The tremendous philosophical problem of the meaning of "probability" in common-sense reality is necessarily beyond the scope of this paper.

philosophy of rhetoric, we must investigate the foundational discipline of philosophy, which is the bedrock, the ultimate and absolute ground of all inquiry.

I propose to understand by philosophy the critique of presuppositions. Philosophy in its synthetic aspect seeks to comprehend the nature of reality by inquiring critically into the categories of reality: quantity, quality, relation, and modality, to refer to the Kantian categories. In its analytic aspect philosophy attempts to bring to clarity the meaning of terms which are basic and crucial to the conceptual structure of all special disciplines. So in history, for example, analytic philosophy investigates the meaning of such terms as "fact," "event," "cause," "effect," "consequence," etc. These are the basic terms out of which history constructs its subject matter and builds its schemata. Both the synthetic and analytic aspects of philosophy turn upon a single, though complex, focal point: the systematic and persistent exploration of elements and themes which are taken for granted in both common-sense reality and in the special disciplines. Thus, philosophy is the critique of such presuppositions as the belief in the existence of an external world, of other fellow men in that world, of communication between those fellow men, etc. Philosophy does not deny the existence of these things; rather it seeks to express their meaningful structure, to bring to complete clarity the conditions which make common-sense experience possible and comprehensible. As a critique of presuppositions, philosophy is a reflexive discipline, i.e., it not only takes for investigation objects and problems external to it, but it also seeks to understand itself. Philosophy is self-problematic: it is the only discipline that begins by inquiring into its own nature and goes on to examine its own instruments of inquiry. The subject matter of philosophy, then, consists of the categories of reality and the basic terms of all particular disciplines; the ultimate goal of the critique of these elements is the reconstruction of the real in perfect self-clarity and illumination.

If this may be taken as the nature of philosophy generally, what is the province of the philosophy of rhetoric? I would suggest that the philosophy of rhetoric directs itself toward the following problems: the relationship between language and what language denotes; the relationship between mind and what mind is aware of; the relationship between knowledge and what knowledge is "of"; the relationship between consciousness and its various contents; etc. Now what differentiates these problems from their generalized setting in the theory of knowledge is the particular kind of context in which these problems arise in rhetoric. Instead of the general problem of meaning, the philosopher of rhetoric is interested in how this problem arises with regard to speaker and listener, poet and reader, playwright and audience. Instead of the epistemology of consciousness, the philosopher of rhetoric directs his attention to those states of consciousness manifest in persuasion. Instead of the generalized problem of knowledge, the philospher of rhetoric attends to the status of that knowledge which the persuader seeks to persuade us of.

The philosophy of rhetoric, then, has as its subject matter the application of the critique of presuppositions to those presuppositions which characterize the fundamental scope of rhetoric: presuppositions in the relationship of speaker and listener, the persuader and the one persuaded, judger and the thing judged.

The specific object of inquiry here is not the technique of speaking or persuading or judging but the very meaning of these activities. Thus rhetoric stands in relation to philosophy as science stands in relation to philosophy. In both cases, philosophy investigates what both disciplines presuppose: knowledge, existence, communication, and value. Just as the philosophy of science analyzes the meaning of such elements as "fact," "causation," and "law," so the philosophy of rhetoric studies the elements of "language," "meaning," and "persuasion." This brings us to the question of the relationship of the philosophy of rhetoric to rhetoric in the narrower sense.

The conclusion of our analysis may be expressed in a typology or hierarchical ordering of the different aspects of rhetoric. This will help to make clear precisely what is meant by rhetoric in the broader and narrower sense of the term. Going from the narrower meaning down to the broadest meaning, we have the following aspects of rhetoric: rhetorical intention in speech or writing, the technique of persuasion, the general rationale of persuasion, and finally the philosophy of rhetoric. Rhetoric in the narrower aspect involves rhetorical intention in the sense that a speaker or writer may devote his effort to persuade for some cause or object. Since much of what is commonly called "bad" rhetoric frequently is found in such efforts, the field of rhetoric understood as the technique of persuasion is systematically studied and taught. Here the teacher of rhetoric investigates the devices and modes of argument, the outline for which is to be found in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* or other classical rhetorics. Reflection of a critical order on the significance and nature of the technique of persuasion brings us to rhetoric understood as the general rationale of persuasion. This is what might be termed the "theory" of rhetoric in so far as the central principles of rhetoric are examined and ordered. The emphasis is on the general principles of rhetoric as rhetoric is intimately related to functional, pragmatically directed contexts. Finally, we come to the critique of the rationale of rhetoric which inquires into the underlying assumptions, the philosophical grounds of all the elements of rhetoric.[22] It is here that a philosophy of rhetoric finds its placement. If rhetoric is bound to and founded on dialectic, and dialectic on philosophy, then the limits of rhetoric find their expression in the matrix of philosophical inquiry.

[22] It is interesting to note that Donald C. Bryant approaches a similar typology, though he stops short of the philosophy of rhetoric as we understand it. Speaking of the rhetorician, Bryant writes, *op. cit.*, p. 408: "the term *rhetorician* will sometimes mean the formulator and philosopher of rhetorical theory; sometimes the teacher of the technique of discourse; sometimes the speaker with rhetorical intention; and finally the student or scholar whose concern is the literary or social or behavioral study of rhetoric. I have been tempted to invent terms to avoid certain of these ambiguities such as *logology*, or even *rhetoristic* (parallel with *sophistic*), but the game would probably not be worth the candle." Our point in this paper has been to show that not only is the game worth the candle, but that in a sense without the game no ultimate rhetoric is possible.

A MEASUREMENT OF AUTHORITARIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD DISCUSSION LEADERSHIP

Franklyn S. Haiman

I

THE word "authoritarianism" is so often employed in casual speech and writing as a term of political opprobrium that some scholars have come to regard it as a hopelessly ambiguous and value-laden concept which had best be rejected as a tool of scholarly discourse. There are others, however, who believe that the term is, or at least can become, a meaningful and reasonably objective label for a clearly definable syndrome of socially significant personality characteristics and attitudes. It would seem to be the responsibility of those of us who use this word in our work to clarify our concept of authoritarianism, to determine through empirical studies whether or not it corresponds to any observable phenomena in the non-verbal world, and to describe what those phenomena are.

Much of this task has already been accomplished in a monumental study published under the title, *The Authoritarian Personality*.[1] In this volume, which reports the results of two and a half years of research by a team of clinical and social psychologists, a picture of authoritarianism is carefully pieced together from the data of attitude scales, clinical interviews, and other personality tests. Although not entirely free from political bias, the authors of this work have attempted to develop and promulgate a psychological rather than political usage of the term. According to their concept, a person can possess certain authoritarian characteristics or attitudes in his human relations without necessarily being a supporter of an authoritarian government or political party.

What is the authoritarian personality as defined by their research, and how is it measured? Very briefly, there are nine variables which were found to constitute the component parts of the authoritarian syndrome. They are: (1) Conventionalism—"rigid adherence to conventional middle class values"; (2) Authoritarian Submission—"submissive, uncritical attitude toward idealized moral authorities of the in-group"; (3) Authoritarian Aggression — "tendency to be on the lookout for and condemn, reject, or punish people who violate conventional values"; (4) Anti-intraception —"opposition to the subjective, the imaginative, the tender-minded"; (5) Superstition and Stereotypy—"the belief in mystical determinants of the individual's fate"; (6) Power and Toughness—"preoccupation with the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension; exaggerated assertion of strength and toughness"; (7) Destructiveness and Cynicism — "generalized hostility, vilification of the human"; (8) Projectivity—"the disposition to believe that wild and dangerous things go on in the world; seeing one's own unconscious

Franklyn S. Haiman (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1948) is Assistant Professor of Public Speaking at Northwestern University. He is the author of Group Leadership and Democratic Action *(Boston, 1951).*

[1] T. W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, and R. Sandford, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York, 1950).

impulses in the world around us"; (9) Sex—"exaggerated concern with sexual 'goings-on.'"[2]

The extent to which these characteristics are present in any individual is measured by the F-Scale, an opinion questionnaire which presents the subject with 29 statements, for each of which he may indicate various degrees of agreement or disagreement.[3] The statements are sufficiently varied and indirect to prevent the subject from guessing what is being measured or predicting what the answers "ought to be."

A few sample statements are: "Someday it will probably be shown that astrology can explain a lot of things." "Familiarity breeds contempt." "Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished." "Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down."

It should be pointed out that the present F-Scale has been evolved by its authors out of several earlier versions. Each edition of the scale was administered to a large number of subjects, and was then examined to discover which items were not doing an effective job of measuring what the total scale was measuring. These items were then either revised or thrown out. The final version of the F-Scale, which has been used in this study, is reported by its authors to have a reliability coefficient of .90.[4]

If we accept the F-Scale, with its component variables, as our operational definition of authoritarianism and as our method of measuring the degree to which these characteristics are present in an individual, what can we then learn about the relationship of the authoritarian personality to attitudes or preferences concerning discussion leadership? Are there certain patterns of discussion leadership which are preferred by people high on the F-Scale and rejected by people low on the F-Scale? Can the authoritarian or nonauthoritarian personality[5] be detected by an opinion questionnaire which deals exclusively with statements about discussion leadership? In other words, can a measurement of attitudes toward discussion leadership fulfill the same purpose as the F-Scale? Are "leader-centered" discussions, as opposed to "group-centered" discussions, generally more attractive to the authoritarian person? These are the

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 224-241. For a more theoretical development of this essentially psychoanalytic concept of authoritarianism, see Erich Fromm, *Escape from Freedom* (New York, 1941); also R. E. Money-Kyrle, *Psychoanalysis and Politics* (New York, 1951).

[3] F for Fascism. The question has been raised as to whether the authors of this scale should have focused their attention so exclusively on the Fascist phenomenon in developing their analysis of the authoritarian character. It is suggested that this approach neglects the "authoritarian of the left" (viz., the Communist) who may not exhibit some of the characteristics measured in the F-Scale, such as "rigid adherence to conventional middle class values." Competent authorities have supported this criticism. See, for instance, Franz Alexander, *Our Age of Unreason* (Philadelphia, 1951), pp. 202-206. It seems to this writer that we can recognize this weakness in the instrument (especially in the name of the instrument, which is unfortunate) but continue to use it as the best thing we have to date. Even Dr. Alexander, who sharply criticizes its shortcomings, also concedes its great value. In defense of the scale it should be noted that most of the factors involved (vilification of the human, projectivity, stereotypy, etc.) are common to authoritarians of all political faiths, and that from the psychoanalytic point of view Communists and Fascists are cut from about the same cloth. We may assume, indeed, that even some form of conventionalism is part of the Communist personality, though Communists professedly reject middle-class or "bourgeois" values and thus reject what is specifically defined as conventionalism on the F-Scale.

[4] Adorno *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 257-258.

[5] Whenever the terms "authoritarian" and "nonauthoritarian" are used henceforth in this paper, the reader should understand that these are not intended as absolute categories. Authoritarianism exists on a continuum, and we are referring to those who are relatively high or relatively low on this scale. It should also be remembered that we are using the terms *as defined by* the F-Scale. The labels are justified only insofar as the F-Scale is accepted as a valid measuring instrument.

questions to which this writer addressed himself in the investigations to be reported in this paper.

II

The study was begun by the construction of a ten-item questionnaire which contained statements about discussion leadership which our theory led us to believe might discriminate between authoritarian and nonauthoritarian viewpoints.[6] A copy of the questionnaire, which shall be referred to hereafter as the LA-Scale (for Leadership Attitudes), is presented in Figure 1.

In scoring the LA-Scale, a plus response to all items except numbers five and six was expected to be more indicative of authoritarianism than a minus response; whereas on items five and six the reverse was expected to be true.

FIGURE 1—LA-SCALE

The following are statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Please mark each one in the left margin, according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement, by using the following scale:

+ 1: slight support, agreement
+ 2: moderate support, agreement
+ 3: strong support, agreement
— 1: slight opposition, disagreement
— 2: moderate opposition, disagreement
— 3: strong opposition, disagreement

IN A SMALL DISCUSSION GROUP, COMMITTEE MEETING, OR CONFERENCE:

—— 1. The responsibility for initiating activities should fall to the leader and the few whom he sees as having ability in that direction.
—— 2. Ultimately the leader should accept the responsibility for the success or failure of the group.
—— 3. The best procedure is for the leader to plan the agenda and then keep the members of the group to it.
—— 4. The leader should be immediately recognizable to an outside observer.
—— 5. If someone doesn't like the way a meeting is going, he should say so and try to do something about it, even if he is not the chairman.
—— 6. Almost anyone can achieve skills necessary to be a leader.
—— 7. It is best if the group discussion leader is an expert on the subject the group is discussing.
—— 8. The leader should be the final arbiter in disputes over the way the meetings are being conducted.
—— 9. The best atmosphere to work for in a group is one where the personal thoughts and feelings of the members are kept to themselves.
—— 10. When two group members cannot seem to get along, the best thing to do is to ignore the difficulty and carry on.

The F-Scale and the LA-Scale were administered, in that order, to 234 subjects, representing as much diversity of background as could be obtained.[7] The subjects included 137 male and female students of college age enrolled at Northwestern University, 66 males and females enrolled in adult education evening courses in Chicago, and 31 elderly women of high socio-economic status residing in a home for the aged.

III

The two scales were scored and the correlation between them was computed. The obtained coefficient of correlation was +.61.[8] This means that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between the F-Scale and the LA-Scale. In view of the nature of the data, it seems to the investigator that the +.61 figure can be interpreted as a rather high correlation. This interpretation is based upon the fact that it was difficult to obtain large numbers of subjects at

[6] Credit for some of these items should be given to a questionnaire developed by the National Training Laboratory for Group Development at Bethel, Maine.

[7] The author is indebted to the following persons who collaborated in the execution of this project: Dean Barnlund, Jeri Jensen, Mark Klyn, and Hildegarde Sletteland.

[8] Using the Pearson's product-moment method, uncorrected for attenuation (which correction would increase the size of the obtained coefficient of correlation).

the extreme ends of the two scales, and what data have been obtained at these extremes suggest that the addition of further such subjects would boost the +.61 statistic.

It can also be concluded that the two instruments are not measuring exactly the same thing—there being some independent variance between them.

An item analysis of the LA-Scale was next undertaken, using a random sample of the highest and lowest quartiles (34 subjects at each end) as criteria groups.[9]

The item analysis reveals that all ten statements on the LA-Scale discriminated to some extent between authoritarian and nonauthoritarian subjects, and were therefore valid items. The three most discriminating items, in the order of their discriminating power, were: Number 3—"The best procedure is for the leader to plan the agenda and then keep the members of the group to it"; Number 10—"When two group members cannot seem to get along, the best thing to do is ignore the difficulty and carry on"; and Number 4—"The leader should be immediately recognizable to an outside observer."

These responses, particularly to item 3 and 4, both of which describe in clear and fairly objective operational terms a "leader-centered" as contrasted to a "group-centered" discussion, provide some support for the notion that "leader-centeredness" and "authoritarianism" are correlative concepts.

The poorest item on the scale, though still with considerable discriminatory power, was Number 6—"Almost anyone can achieve skills necessary to be a leader." (It should be recalled that this was one of the two statements on the questionnaire where an affirmative response was scored as nonauthoritarian.)

Two of the items—Number 5 and 7—produced somewhat unusual results. They consistently detected people at one end of the F-Scale but not at the other. Item 5—"If someone doesn't like the way a meeting is going, he should say so and try to do something about it, even if he is not the chairman"—was an excellent indicator of nonauthoritarians; i.e., they responded almost unanimously in agreement with the statement. But it was not reliable as an indicator of the authoritarian group—in fact, a majority of them (60% to be exact) *also* agreed with the statement. There are two possible explanations that might be advanced for this. One is that the philosophy expressed in the statement is so firmly embedded in the American culture that most people would be inclined to pay lip service to it even though they might not actually behave in accordance with the principle. The other possibility is that a "halo" effect was operating in the marking of the test—i.e., that the tendency to respond positively to the eight items which were phrased for plus responses by the authoritarians carried over to this item, which, it was expected, they would mark negatively. This speculation seems invalidated by the fact that the nonauthoritarians were not thrown off *their* course by the reversal of signs on this question. But then, our basic theory of authoritarianism does suggest that highly authoritarian individuals are more prone to inflexibility of response than nonauthoritarians.

Item 7—"It is best if the group dis-

[9] For those unfamiliar with the technique of item analysis, this simply means that two piles of test papers were set up—one with 34 of the highest scores in it and the other with 34 of the lowest scores in it. For each item on the test a determination was made of the proportion in the high group responding favorably to the item, and the proportion in the low group responding favorably. If there is a difference between the way the two groups responded to the item, it is said to have discriminatory power.

cussion leader is an expert on the subject the group is discussing"—produced the same unusual phenomenon as Number 5, but in reverse. While the authoritarians were almost unanimous in their agreement, as was expected, the nonauthoritarians were split 50-50 by the item. This might be explained by a possible confusion in their minds between a "resource leader" and a "procedural leader." In other words, one could be attracted to agree with such a statement on nonauthoritarian grounds if one were semantically confused by the two possible referents of the word "leader." Such confusion, if it existed, would not have affected the responses of the authoritarians, since they could agree with the item using either interpretation of the word "leader."

Items Number 8, 9, 1, and 2 (in that order) were all highly discriminating at both ends of the continuum. It is interesting, however, to note another subtlety here. The negation of item 9—"The best atmosphere to work for in a group is one where the personal thoughts and feelings of the members are kept to themselves"—by the nonauthoritarians was more clear-cut than its affirmation by the authoritarians; whereas item 1—"The responsibility for initiating activities should fall to the leader and the few whom he sees as having ability in that direction"—evoked an affirmation from the authoritarians that was sharper than the negation it provoked from the nonauthoritarians. In other words, it would seem that nonauthoritarians favor a "permissive" atmosphere more strongly than the authoritarians oppose it; and that authoritarians favor the exclusive leader-initiation of activities more strongly than the nonauthoritarians oppose it. All the other items on the questionnaire (except 5 and 7, whose unique characteristics have already been discussed) evoked approximately the same degree of feeling from both authoritarians and nonauthoritarians, each in their respective directions.

IV

Within the limits of our sample, we are now in a position to answer some of the questions posed at the outset of this study. If we take the F-Scale, developed by Adorno and colleagues, as our definition or criterion of authoritarianism, we can say that there are certain patterns of discussion leadership which tend to be preferred by the highly authoritarian personality and rejected by the relatively nonauthoritarian individual. These patterns may generally be described as "leader-centered," in contrast to the "group-centered" and "permissive" patterns which tend to be preferred by nonauthoritarians. We are also now in a position to assert that authoritarian and nonauthoritarian characteristics can be predicted to some extent by an instrument, such as the LA-Scale, which deals exclusively with attitudes toward discussion leadership.

The significance of these findings for the student of discussion would seem to be: (1) that the discussion group is a microcosm of society at large, and that its preferred patterns of leadership may be clues to the broader social-psychological orientation of its members; (2) that it is possible, through relatively simple questionnaires concerning discussion leadership, to determine, to some extent, important personality characteristics of the members of a group; and (3) that as a result of such measurement, an increase in the prediction and control of group behavior is possible.

WHAT IS SPEECH? A SYMPOSIUM

Henry L. Ewbank, Sr., A. Craig Baird, W. Norwood Brigance, Wayland M. Parrish, *and* Andrew T. Weaver

I

Henry L. Ewbank, Sr.

Your Honor:

I plead the Fifth Amendment. I refuse to answer the question lest I *re*criminate myself! Moreover, I invoke that precious but too little used Fifth Freedom—liberty to keep quiet when one has nothing to say.

Judge, it happened this way. It all began when I was smitten, hip and thigh, with a smooth blunt weapon later identified as a piece of hardwood floor. During my residence in the sick bay a letter asking me to join this distinguished panel was lost. The first I knew of the subpoena was when I saw it in the printed program.

Even had I been able to think my way through to an answer to the question under scrutiny, I could add nothing to the statement of the other witnesses.

To assist them, with your permission, I give, devise, and bequeath one minute of my time to each member of the panel.

II

A. Craig Baird

Humpty Dumpty on his high wall was having a knockdown argument with Alice below, who had wandered in from Wonderland through the Looking Glass.

"When *I* use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you *can* make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all . . ."

"Would you tell me, please," said Alice, "what that means?"

Said Humpty Dumpty, looking very pleased, "I mean by 'impenetrability' that we've had enough of that subject, and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life."

"That's a good deal to make one word mean," Alice said, in a thoughtful tone.

"When I make a word do a lot of work like that," said Humpty Dumpty, "I always pay it extra."

"Oh," said Alice. She was too much puzzled to make any other remark.

Like Alice some of us are puzzled—in this case by the length and breadth of *Speech*. Shall we join the Humpty Dumpties who prefer oral communication? Or speech correction? Or dramatic arts? Or mass communication on radio and television? Or voice and phonetics? Or rhetoric? Or shall we plumb the depths and view speech as the dynamic that best explains our ongoing civilization?

The general symbol, Speech, still stands at the masthead of our common stationery. We await the coming gener-

At the Association Luncheon on December 29, 1954, in the Boulevard Room of the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago, five elder statesmen of the SAA, under the chairmanship of Max Fuller, spoke on the topic, What is Speech? Their speeches were collected by Thomas A. Rousse, President of the SAA, and are here printed in the approximate form in which they were delivered.

So these "academic" teachers forty years ago started searching for a term that would include the whole field and would *not be the special property of any one part.* The search continued until the third Annual Convention, December 29, 1917, again held in the old Auditorium Hotel. At that meeting, on December 29, thirty-seven years ago today, at 11:00 a.m., John P. Ryan of Grinnell College put the following recommendation before the Convention:

> The most cursory examination of college catalogues reveals a variety of names. In one group . . . the title is Public Speaking. Its variants are: Public Speaking and Debating; Public Speaking and Reading; Public Speaking and English; Public Speaking and Argumentation; Public Speaking and Oratory. . . .
>
> In another group . . . the name . . . is English. Fortunately the variants are more numerous than the standard. The chief variants are: Oral English; Vocal English; Spoken English; Special English; English and Debating; English and Public Speaking; English and Rhetoric. . . .
>
> In a small group there are a number of colleges which hold to that good old word Oratory. It, too, has many variants: Oratory and Expression; Oratory and Composition; Oratory and Rhetoric; Oratory and Vocal Culture. . . .
>
> The best title under which to work is Department of Speech. The word speech is old, short, simple, stable, well-known, accurate, common, learned, definite, extensive, and academically acceptable. . . . Small and simple as is the word speech, yet it is the only word large enough to cover the present activities. . . .

In January, 1918, our journal, called up till then *The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking*, carried the following report of that third Annual Convention (p. 114):

> Immediately following the reading of Professor Ryan's paper it was voted, almost unanimously, . . . that our departments should be called departments of speech. . . . At a meeting of the Executive Committee . . . Saturday afternoon [i.e. following Ryan's paper that morning] . . . it was unanimously voted . . . that the name of the Association should henceforth be "The National Association of Teachers of Speech," and that the name of *The Quarterly* should be *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education.*

So after twenty-five years we were *all* joined in *one* organization; and after 2,000 years we had a name: *Speech.* It was a name that included everything and left out nothing. It was a name that, as Ryan said, was old, short, simple, accurate, learned, and academically acceptable. Especially it was a name not borrowed from any one area, not from public speaking, dramatics, speech correction, interpretation, or any other.

This, then, is what *Speech* means to me: the whole field in general, and no one part of it in particular.

So it is that I am disturbed in looking over university catalogues to see once more so many names for the same thing: Department of Speech and Drama; Department of Speech and Dramatic Art; Department of Speech and Theatre; Department of Speech and Radio; Department of Speech, Radio, and Drama; Department of Speech and Radio Education. I agree with Claude Wise in his address before the 1954 Southern Speech Convention that such titles are like hearing of a Department of Mathematics and Algebra, a Department of Mathematics and Geometry, or a Department of Mathematics and Trigonometry.

I remember once when I was representing the Speech Association of America at a meeting of the American Council of Education. I was talking in the lobby of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington to an educator who was then a dean, and is now a university president. He asked, "Why doesn't the term *speech* include *drama?*" I replied, "It really does. Our Association agreed on that in 1917." Then came a more difficult question, "Why do some departments call themselves the Department of Speech and Drama?" To which I

could only answer, "I don't know, except that they want to be individualists." Next came a still sharper question, "But why do even individualists want to confuse educators in other fields?" Remember, please, that I was not exactly free to speak as an individual. I was representing the Speech Association of America, and even in a hotel lobby I had a responsibility to be spokesman for that Association. As I hesitated in replying, there came that final question, "Is it possible that some people in the field of Speech aren't exactly clear where they belong in education?" I escaped answering that by finding an excuse to talk about color photography, and I hope never to be asked that question again!

IV

Wayland M. Parrish

There is a story you doubtless know of a man who once borrowed a bowl from his neighbor, and who was accused of returning it in a damaged condition. Against this charge he made a threefold defence—as airtight as the mechanical "case" of one of our card-file debaters: "First, the bowl was perfectly sound when I returned it. Second, the bowl was already cracked when I borrowed it. Third, I never borrowed the bowl."

I am tempted to make a similar threefold answer to our inquiry today. First, Speech is whatever you find offered in a Speech department. Second, there isn't any such subject as Speech. Third, I don't know what it is.

The question arises, of course, because of the exuberant proliferation of our field. We began simply enough some forty years ago with courses in public speaking, debating, interpretation, and play production. But look at us now! If you look through the offerings of modern university departments of Speech you find such items as speech science, experimental phonetics, phonemics, semantics, linguistics, discussion, conference speaking, conversation, group dynamics, propaganda, communication, listening, rhetorical theory, ancient, medieval, and modern rhetoric, history of oratory, American public address, British public address, motion pictures, radio broadcasting, television production, adult education, audiovisual aids, history of the theatre, dramatic composition, styles of acting, psychodrama, socio-drama, psycho-socio-drama, stage lighting, scene design, costuming, speech correction, audiometry, aural rehabilitation, speech therapy, electroacoustics, and so on, and on, and on. What is Speech, indeed?

But to see how far some of us have wandered off the reservation you should look at the titles of graduate theses as they are annually reported by Professor Dow. For instance:

> The Effects of Cortical Ablations in Monkeys on the Galvanic Skin Response to Pure Tone Stimulation
>
> Dress of the Middle Class in England and France, 1350-1630
>
> An Investigation into the Techniques, Equipment and Problems Associated with Under-Water Cinematography
>
> An Analysis of the Communication Aspects of Marital Maladjustments
>
> A Survey of Reasons for Proposed Legislation Limiting Liability for Defamation by Radio and Television in Massachusetts
>
> The Hypersensitization of Sixteen Millimeter Black and White Motion Picture Film by Pre-Exposure to Light

All of these doubtless were worthy studies, but may I suggest mildly that I find it difficult to discover their relationship to Speech as I have understood it.

Consider also the fantastic technical vocabulary we have acquired to accompany these far-flung studies. The young

graduate student exploring our publications will come across such esoteric terms as epideictic eloquence, enthymematic argument, infraglottal resonance, hypacousic ears, otorhinologic therapy, functional dysphonia, electroencephalographic etiology, phonemic microtomy, Roentgen kymography, etc. Up to the ears in such abstruse verbiage, he may indeed wonder, "What is Speech?"

It seems to me very significant that it is no longer possible for a professor of Speech to be master of his field. He can know only parts of it. And he cannot competently direct graduate study in all phases of the subject. And what about the young student confronted with this bewildering complexity? What does it mean to him to begin the study of Speech? Do our graduate majors have anything in common? Is there for speech teachers and students any common ground of interest and of knowledge? In our pride in the growth and expansion of our subject, we ought to be aware that it has been *growth away from the center*, and that the center has become almost completely obscured by the proliferation of the foliage.

Our object today is, I take it, to try to rediscover this center, to try to find some common ground on which we can all get together.

I know of no better attempt to rationalize our development and reveal its central core than that of Professor Wallace published in the April *QJS* in 1954. It stated, you will remember, that the core of our subject is "the act and art of oral communication." This does indeed designate the center from which we have departed, though it doesn't bind us together now, and it doesn't indicate the specific atoms that compose the nucleus. It is the administrator's rationale, his justification to the dean of our far-flung dispersion.

Besides, I am suspicious of that word "communication." It covers too much ground. It is an abyss that might engulf the whole university curriculum, and it almost has. It can readily be made to include newspaper publishing, book printing, selling by mail, billboards, sign-painting, railroad signals, direction lights, traffic signs, fire sirens, bell ringing, and factory whistles. Even if you qualify it by "oral," it covers infant wails, hog calling, carol singing, and all the far-flung activities of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company; and it might lead to courses in pole climbing, wire splicing, and switchboard operation.

In our earlier days the need for a common ground was sometimes recognized by establishing courses called "Fundamentals of Speech." But so far as I have observed them, these consisted merely in bits and pieces from the various areas of speech. Each student made a speech, took part in debate, read a poem, and acted in a play. He got acquainted with the various areas of speech, but he might still miss training in the fundamentals that all these areas have in common. What are the fundamentals of speech?

I was early taught that the proper way to get at the essential nature of a thing is to look at its roots, to see what it started from.

Professor Brigance has presented vividly the origin of our Association. There was, of course, a common interest that brought together those founding fathers, though we don't have any very specific statement of it. I suspect that it was an interest in public speaking more than anything else. When I first took part in a convention program some thirty years ago, just eight years after the founding, there was still a marked community of interest among the members.

In that meeting at Cincinnati we met for three days, as we still do, but the Saturday session was merely a business meeting. On each of the other days, there was *one* session in the morning and *one* in the afternoon, and all of us attended all of the sessions because there was nowhere else to go. (That was during Prohibition, and there was no bar where the bored might seek relief.) There were papers on various phases of Speech, but they were not so specialized and technical as to be beyond the general interest. It was a little later that we began to develop the exfoliations, protuberances, deviations, and excrescences that make up our present rank growth.

What is Speech? To get at the seed from which this growth sprouted, the root which nourished its development and which should still feed it, I think we will have to go farther back than the founding of this Association. I would go back two hundred years to the beginning of what is called "the elocution movement." If you will examine, as I have, those early works by Mason, Burgh, Sheridan, Rice, Enfield, Steele, Cockin, and Walker, you will find that those teachers were concerned simply with improving the speaking of their students—developing better voices, better pronunciation, better vocal expression. And if you will examine, as I have, the dozens of books that appeared during the nineteenth century, from Rush through Curry, you will find the same interest. The topics treated are almost uniformly voice, articulation, tempo, emphasis, pause, and inflection. (There was also, of course, a good deal of attention paid to gesture, which, for present purposes, I am ignoring. I am ignoring also the parallel development of rhetoric during this period.)

These topics, it seems to me, constitute the core of our discipline. These are the fundamentals of speech. They are the constant elements in all our speech activities, whether public address, interpretation, acting, or conversation. I fear that many of us have lost interest in them, and they are being seriously neglected. We graduate as Speech majors students who have wretched voices and cannot articulate clearly. We accept as teachers many who do not naturally speak well and who have not had the training that would overcome their defects. The results of our neglect are plainly apparent in the speech of many who read papers at our conventions. Whether we like it or not, we have got to get back to the fundamentals of speech and practice the "finger exercises" of speech training.

If you ask the man in the street, the man who pays the taxes that support us, what he expects from a teacher of Speech, I think he will say that he expects you to improve the speaking of his and other people's children; that is, to develop better voices, better articulation, better elocution. He will not be impressed by learned dissertations on phonemic microtomy or infraglottal resonance. I think he is right. We need to get back to basic training in good speaking. All of our present monumental structure rests upon this base. We neglect it at our peril.

V

Andrew T. Weaver

Last summer I was fortunate—or unfortunate—enough to have in my Psychology of Speech course a queer *oiseau* who seemed to derive sadistic satisfaction from uttering uncomplimentary comments on my classroom procedures. To make these gibes even more unpleasant, instead of following the common student custom of expressing his unfav-

orable judgments to others, leaving me in blissful ignorance of his reactions, he insisted upon confronting me personally with his criticisms! One day he blurted out: "Your lectures are all cut and dried, aren't they?" This rhetorical question nettled me, and I retorted: "They may be dried, but they haven't yet been cut." I am fearful that what I say here today may fall under your just condemnation as both dried and cut!

I had hoped that by the time the preceding speakers had given us their opinions, there might be little for me to say beyond a hearty Amen. However, as J. M. O'Neill observed in his presidential address at our first convention, "I feel confident that we shall be spared the blight of unanimity of opinion for some time to come." Yesterday, as I listened to a discussion of the state of affairs in beginning courses, I was reminded of that wise pronouncement. I was delighted to hear one of the speakers echo O'Neill's sentiment by cautioning us against the error of assuming that diversity of viewpoints and methods is bad per se.

But to my assigned task:

The term *Speech,* as I use it, may be defined as the process by which one individual (the speaker) seeks to stimulate and influence the mental activity of another individual (or other individuals) through the use of visible and/or audible symbols produced solely, and without instrumental mediation, by the speaker's own muscles and mental activity.

Speech is reciprocal in nature; the speaker stimulates the reactor, whose overt responses stimulate the speaker, who then restimulates the reactor, etc., etc., etc., so long as the speaking continues.

We cannot actually and literally *communicate* or *transfer* meanings to others; all we can hope to do is to *stir up* meanings in others. Therefore, the meanings which the reactor gets come not from the speaker but from himself.

Normally, speech involves at least two persons, although it is possible for a single individual to play a dual role by speaking to himself. It should be noted that, when we have learned to talk to ourselves in ways which cannot be observed by others, we have developed the essential mechanisms of mental life.

One of Charles Woolbert's greatest contributions to us was his lucid fourfold analysis of speech into (1) Mental Processes, (2) Language, (3) Voice, and (4) Visible Action. Woolbert did not claim to have invented these concepts, but he stated them with a conciseness, a completeness, and a clarity which embedded them deeply in Speech Education as the very cornerstone of our philosophy and practice.

The social function of speech is to promote co-ordinated, co-operative group activity.

Being human, speech can never reach perfection.

The dominant objectives in speech training are *knowledge* and *proficiency,* and there are three common approaches to these: (1) the *utilitarian,* which stresses practical, economic, problem-solving uses; (2) the *aesthetic,* which emphasizes the various types of artistic performance; and (3) the *scientific,* which focuses the light of undertsanding on the physical, physiological, and psychological aspects of speaking and listening.

As I see it, Speech is most intimately interrelated with the following branches of learning: language and literature, anatomy, neurology, physiology, physics, history, medicine, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and art education and criticism.

During the past half century the curriculum in Speech has expanded astonishingly until it now includes: (1) *Informal Speech*, (2) *Rhetoric and Public Speaking*, (3) *Interpretative Speech*, (4) *Drama and Theatre*, (5) *Speech Pathology and Audiology*, (6) *Voice Training and Science*, (7) *The Psychology of Speech*, (8) *Speech Education*, and (9) *Information Theory*. Doubtless, in the future many other fields will be added to the foregoing list.

Professor Parrish has spoken apprehensively of the apparently endless proliferation of subject matter and courses in the field of Speech. While I yield to no one in my conviction that we should cherish the basic unity of our discipline, I think that any academic area must grow or die and that Speech, by its very nature, must continue to send out new branches. Our concern should be to see that these diverse tendrils are genuine offshoots of the parent vine. We should be ever alert to claim any new development in which speech plays the paramount role—but, obviously we cannot properly establish hegemony over every educational activity which, more or less incidentally, involves speech.

May I close with a brief statement of what Speech means to me?

Speech is man's greatest discovery and invention.

In that dim and misty age, before the dawn of history, speech was on man's tongue and in his ears when he was but an infant on the earth. Speech was with him when he lived in caves and carved crude symbols on the walls, striving to picture it in visible form. Through speech, man's traditions were preserved and passed along from generation to generation. Through speech, men learned to live together in families and to co-operate for the promotion of the common welfare.

Speech forms that inner stream of awareness which we call mind. Speech molds us in its own image. Speech teaches us to know and to sympathize with one another. Speech enables us to think clearly, feel truly, judge justly, and act wisely.

Were speech to fail, our intelligence would lapse to the level of the beasts, each individual would dwell apart from his fellows, the structure of society would crumble, the very fabric of life itself would disintegrate, and all the vital processes of civilization would grind to a faltering stop.

Speech reflects the history of all that is past and prophesies all that is yet to be. Of speech Confucius said, "What man requires to administer government is that in his words there be nothing incorrect." Dante sang, "It must be done by speech or not at all." And mindful of the power of speech, Mentor Graham, humble teacher of the immortal Lincoln, charged his pupil never to forget that "the right words will guide the world."

Speech is man's greatest achievement and his crowning glory.

A PREACHER IN DIFFICULTY

A celebrated preacher, well known as an eccentrick character, stopped short in the pulpit; it was in vain that he scratched his head; nothing would come out. "My friends," said he, as he walked quietly down the pulpit stairs, "my friends, I pity you, for you have lost a fine discourse."

New-York Mirror, XIV (September 3, 1836), 80.

THE PERSISTENCY OF THE EFFECT OF ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECHES

Harvey Cromwell

I

THIS article is concerned with the persistency of the influence on audience attitude of argumentative speeches. Specifically, it is designed to report the results of studying the question, Does a shift in audience attitude procured by an argumentative speech persist after a period of thirty days?

II

Data were collected on 1319 students enrolled in the basic Speech course at Purdue University and Mississippi State College for Women (1174 served as an experimental group and 145 as a control group). Since Knower had reported a difference in the shift of attitude produced by male and female listeners to a male speaker,[1] the percentage of men and women was held constant within each of the experimental situations described below.

An affirmative and a negative speech were prepared on two propositions: (1) the federal government should provide medical care available to all people; and (2) the federal government should require arbitration of labor disputes. Two propositions were used to minimize the possibility of spurious results arising from some peculiarity of one type of subject material.

Since it had been shown by other investigators that a speech can influence the attitude of listeners in the direction advocated by the speech,[2] I thought it desirable that the speeches used in this study should be effective speeches advocating the two sides of the two propositions. The four speeches were submitted during their preparation to three members of the Purdue Speech staff, who were instructed to judge the speeches subjectively according to strength and comparable effectiveness in advocating the respective advantages and disadvantages of the two propositions. On the basis of the judgments received, the speeches were revised until they were judged as being equal in effectiveness. Next, the speeches were subjected to a test of effectiveness based on the ratings of student listeners. Student listeners were used since previous investigators had shown that the mean of the ratings of 31 or more student listeners provides a highly reliable measure in judging

Harvey Cromwell (Ph.D., Purdue, 1949), Professor of Speech and Head of the Department of Speech at Mississippi State College for Women. is Editor of The Forensic *and has contributed frequently to journals in the field of speech and psychology.*

[1] Franklin H. Knower, "Experimental Studies in Changes in Attitude: I. A Study of the Effect of Oral Argument on Changes in Attitude," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VI (1935), 315-347.

[2] Among those who have reported such a conclusion are: W. K. C. Chen, "The Influence of Oral Propaganda Material upon Student's Attitudes," *Archives of Psychology*, XXIII, No. 150 (1933); B. M. Cherrington and L. W. Miller, "Changes in Attitudes as the Result of a Lecture and of Reading Similar Materials," *Journal of Social Psychology*, IV (1933), 479-484; Harvey Cromwell, "The Relative Effect on Audience Attitude of the First Versus the Second Argumentative Speech of a Series," *SM*, XVII (1950), 3-20; Harvey Cromwell and Richard Kunkel, "An Experimental Study of the Effect on the Attitude of Listeners of Repeating the Same Oral Propaganda," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XXXV (1952), 175-184; Paul E. Lull, "The Effectiveness of Humor in Persuasive Speech," *SM*, VII (1940), 26-40.

the effectiveness of an argumentative speech.[3] Each auditor completed a speech rating-blank which consisted of an Effectiveness Scale ranging from 1 (very poor) to 5 (excellent) for the speeches heard. The mean rating of the 65 students who heard the speech on the affirmative side of the subject of medical care (hereafter referred to as MA) was 4.184; the negative speech on that subject (hereafter called MN) was 4.246; the labor-affirmative (or LA) speech was 4.200; and the labor-negative (or LN) was 4.123.

To assure no variations in the subject material, organization, and delivery of the speeches used in the study, each speech was recorded by a male speaker and subsequently replayed in the experimental situations.

The standard procedure used for the experimental groups was as follows:

1. The proposition was written on the blackboard.
2. A prepared announcement was made that an experimental study was being conducted to obtain a clearer understanding of some of the problems of public speaking and audience reactions.
3. A form of the attitude scale was given to each auditor for completion. This form was collected as soon as it was completed.
4. A recorded speech connected with that particular attitude was presented.
5. The second form of the attitude scale was given to each auditor for completion.
6. Thirty days later each auditor completed a form of the attitude scale.

The procedure followed for the control groups was similar to that used for the experimental groups except that the members of the control groups did not hear the argumentative speeches.

[3] Alan H. Monroe, H. H. Remmers, and E. V. Lyle, "Measuring the Effectiveness of Public Speaking in a Beginning Course," *Studies in Higher Education*, XXIX, Bulletin of Purdue University, XXXVII, No. 1 (1936).

The control groups were used for two purposes: (1) as a measurement of any variable that might be introduced into the experiment by changing conditions outside its confines and beyond the control of the investigator during the time between the beginning and the end of the experiment; and (2) as a measurement to determine the reliability of the two forms of the attitude scale, to correct for any differences in scale values that might exist between the forms of the attitude scale for the subjects and propositions used in the experiment, and to adjust population variances that might exist between the groups of auditors.

The attitude scale selected as the measuring device was a generalized scale (Thurstone type) developed and validated by Thomas to measure attitude toward any proposed social action.[4] The reliability of the forms of the Thomas Scale as a measure of the attitude of the subjects in this experiment, according to the equivalent-forms method, was found to be .88 for the Labor proposition and .95 for the Medicine proposition. Since the results were comparable to the reliability of the forms established by Thomas, it is reasonable to assume that they were reliable as a measure of attitude for the two propositions used in this study. In a previous investigation, I found that the pooled reactions of 58 auditors using the Thomas Scale would provide a satisfactory test (a reliability coefficient of .90) of the effectiveness of an argumentative speech.[5] Since the pooled reactions of 287 to 300 auditors were used in each experiment, it seems safe to conclude

[4] Dorothy Thomas Banes, "The Construction and Evaluation of a Scale to Measure Attitude toward any Proposed Social Action," *Studies in Higher Education*, XXXI, Bulletin of Purdue University, XXXVII (1936), 252-258.

[5] See my study in *SM* as described above, note 2.

TABLE I

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECHES IN SHIFTING AUDIENCE ATTITUDE

Speech used	Number of auditors	Mean of the pre-speech attitude	Mean of the post-speech attitude	Diff. of the means	Standard error of the diff. of the means	*t*	*P*
MA	292	7.107	7.364	.257	.071	3.62	.01
MN	295	6.995	6.110	.885	.072	12.57	.01
LA	287	7.714	7.923	.209	.051	4.09	.01
LN	300	7.792	6.659	1.133	.085	13.33	.01

TABLE II

THE PERSISTENCY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECHES ON THE ATTITUDE OF LISTENERS AFTER A THIRTY-DAY PERIOD

Speech used	Number of auditors	Mean of the pre-speech attitude	Mean of the audience attitude after 30 days	Diff. of the means	Standard error of the diff. of the means	*t*	*P*
MA	292	7.107	7.200	.093	.072	1.29	.20
MN	295	6.995	6.358	.637	.087	7.32	.01
LA	287	7.714	7.812	.098	.062	1.58	.11
LN	300	7.792	7.105	.687	.087	7.90	.01

that the reliability of the Thomas Scale was adequately high for this study.

The statistical procedure used for analyzing the data procured from the investigations included the following: (1) computing the standard error of the difference between the means of the predicted and obtained scores in the experimental groups; (2) determining the significance ratio (*t*); and (3) interpreting *t* in terms of *P* or the chances in 100 of getting a difference as large as the one secured even if the true difference were as low as zero.[6]

III

As I stated previously, the specific objective of this experiment was to determine if the effect on audience attitude of argumentative speeches persists after a period of thirty days. In order to answer this question, I thought it necessary to determine the immediate effect of the argumentative speeches on the attitude of the listeners as well as the effect remaining thirty days later. As noted in Table I, each speech produced in the attitude of the listeners toward the side advocated in the speech an *immediate* shift that was significant at less than the .01% level of confidence.

The data in Table II, however, show that the induced shifts in the attitude did not persist; instead, the auditors tended to return to their original attitude.[7] The *t's* representing the shift in audience attitude remaining after thirty days were equal to 7.32 for the MN

[6] For complete discussion of the statistical procedures used, see C. C. Peters and W. R. Van Voorhis, *Statistical Procedures and Their Mathematical Bases*, (New York, 1940), pp. 160-179, 463-467; or Harvey Cromwell, "An Experimental Design for Determining Induced Changes in the Attitude of Others," *Southern Speech Journal*, XVI (1951), 198-206.

[7] Among those who have reached the same conclusion are: R. M. Bateman and H. H. Remmers, "A Study of the Shifting Attitude of High School Students When Subjected to Favorable and Unfavorable Propaganda," *Journal of Social Psychology*, XIII (1941), 395-406; W. K. C. Chen, "Retention of the Effect of Oral Propaganda," *Journal of Social Psychology*, VII (1936), 479-483; Cromwell and Kunkel, p. 181; Lull, pp. 26-40.

speech and 7.90 for the LN speech. Significance ratios of these sizes are highly significant, and the probability of the influence of these two speeches being equal to zero after thirty days may be discarded at better than the .01% level of confidence. The *t* values representing the shift in audience attitude remaining after thirty days were equal to 1.29 for the MA speech and 1.58 for the LA speech. While *t* values of these sizes are not normally acceptable as possessing significance, they do indicate that the odds are 4 to 1 and 8 to 1 that the MA and LA speeches, respectively, continued to influence the attitude of the listeners after thirty days.

A comparison of the difference of the means listed in Tables I and II will show that in terms of the per cent of the immediate shift in audience attitude that persisted after the thirty-day period, those who heard the MA speech retained 36% of their immediate shift in attitude; the LA, 47%; the MN, 72%; and the LN, 66%.

Although the four speeches used in this experiment had been judged as strong and equally effective, it is interesting to note that each speech varied in its power to shift the attitude of the listeners and in the influence it exercised on the listeners' attitude after thirty days. It is also interesting to note that the listeners who heard the affirmative speeches retained approximately one-third of their immediate shift in attitude after thirty days, and that those who heard the negative speeches retained approximately two-thirds of their immediate shift in attitude. A similar result with different subjects and speeches had already been reported.[8] It should be noted here that although the negative speeches produced the greater immediate effect on the attitude of the listeners (Table I), there is no evidence that negative speeches exercise a greater influence on audience attitude after thirty days than is exercised by affirmative speeches. The evidence does imply, however, that the stronger the immediate effect on the attitude of listeners of a recorded argumentative speech, the greater the influence that speech exercises on the attitude of the listeners after thirty days and the greater the probability that the effect persisting is not equal to zero.

Reference to Table III will show that no statistically significant shift in attitude occurred among the members of the control groups during the time required to conduct the experiment.

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF THE ATTITUDES OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CONTROL GROUPS DURING THE THIRTY-DAY PERIOD

Proposition used	Number of auditors	Mean of the pre-speech attitude	Mean of attitude after 30 days	Diff. of the means	Standard error of the diff. of the means	*t*	*P*
Medicine	73	6.254	6.311	.057	.150	.38	
Labor	72	7.805	7.745	.060	.151	.40	

IV

Based on the experimental data reported and analyzed in this article, the following conclusions regarding the per-

[8] Cromwell and Kunkel, p. 181.

sistency after thirty days of the effect of argumentative speeches seem justified:

1. Argumentative speeches rated as strong in effectiveness produce significant shifts in the attitude of listeners toward the side advocated by the speaker.
2. Although, after thirty days, auditors who heard strong argumentative speeches regress toward their original attitude, the evidence indicates that they are still influenced by the speeches.
3. The evidence also indicates that the stronger the immediate effectiveness of the argumentative speech, the greater the influence it exercises on the attitude of the listeners after thirty days.

ORATORICAL SUBLIMITY

Upon a certain time, an orator, who wished to advocate the construction of a new turnpike-road through a section in Virginia made the following sublime speech, as we learn from the *Marshall Sentinel:*

> "May it please your worships, while Europe is convulsed in civil discords, and her empires tremble with internal commotions, and while her astronomers mount the wings of their imagination, and soar through the ethereal world, pursuing their courses from system to system, until they have explored the vast eternity of space—let us direct our attention *to a road* more immediately in our neighbourhood!"

New-York Mirror, XIV (July 30, 1836), 35.

ORDER

A quaker, named Benjamin Lay, (who was a little cracked in the head, though sound at heart,) took one of his compositions to Benjamin Franklin, to have it printed and published in his paper. Franklin, having looked over the manuscript, observed that it was deficient in arrangement. "No matter," replied the author, "print any part thou pleasest first." Many are the speeches, and the sermons, and the treatises, and the poems, and the volumes which are like Benjamin Lay's book; the head might serve for the tail, and the tail for the body, and the body for the head; either end for the middle, and the middle for either end; nay, if you could turn them inside out, like a glove, they would be no worse for the operation. When the excellent Hooker was on his deathbed, he expressed his joy at the prospect of entering a world of order.

New-York Mirror, XII (July 5, 1834), 8.

JOHN BRIGHT AS SPEAKER AND STUDENT OF SPEAKING

Joseph O. Baylen

IN mid-October, 1888, the publicist W. T. Stead called to Gladstone's attention a letter which John Bright had written to the Reverend G. E. Cheeseman on "public speaking," and which Cheeseman had recently published in *The Times*. The epistle inspired the enterprising Stead to propose the publication in his *Pall Mall Gazette* of "a collection of personal experiences—much as Mr. Bright has published—by other leading orators of the day." The collection, Stead thought, would serve as the "advice of those who are already past-masters in the art . . ." and would be addressed, not only to young men preparing for the pulpit or a parliamentary career, but, above all, to the "average Englishman [who finds it difficult] to stand up and speak for 10 minutes without looking ashamed of himself. . . ."[1] Although Stead was unsuccessful in obtaining Gladstone's collaboration, the letter which inspired his abortive project is of more than passing interest to the students of English political oratory because of what it reveals of John Bright's thoughts on preparation and delivery in public speaking and because it was his last mature reflection on this subject before his death in late March, 1889.

The Reverend Mr. Cheeseman had written to Bright seeking advice "as to the various methods of preparation" for public speaking with particular emphasis on the following topics:

> (1) writing speeches and reading them; (2) writing and committing to memory; and (3) sketching the heads of the topic and trusting to the inspiration of the moment for the words in which to clothe the thought.[2]

Bright, as was his wont, obligingly replied in a modest letter:

> As to the modes of preparation for public speaking, it seems to me that every man would readily discover what suits him best. To write speeches and then commit them to memory is, as you term it, a double slavery, which I could not bear. To speak without preparation, especially on great and solemn topics, is rashness and cannot be recommended. When I intend to speak on anything that seems to me important, I consider what it is that I wish to impress upon my audience. I do not write my facts or my arguments, but make notes on two or three slips of note paper, giving the line of argument and the facts as they occur to my mind, and I leave the words to come at call while I am speaking. There are occasionally short passages which for accuracy I may write down, as sometimes also—almost invariably—the concluding words or sentences may be written. This is very nearly all I can say on this question. The advantage of this plan is that while it leaves a certain and sufficient freedom to the speaker, it keeps him within the main lines of the original plan upon which the speech was framed, and what he says, therefore, is more likely to be compact and not wandering and diffuse. Forgive me if

Joseph O. Baylen (Ph.D., New Mexico, 1949) is Chairman of the Department of Social Science, Mississippi Delta State Teachers College, Cleveland, Mississippi.

[1] W. T. Stead to W. E. Gladstone, October 17, 1888. Gladstone Papers, Add. MS. 44303, Vol. CCXVIII, British Museum. Stead was undoubtedly motivated by Gladstone's fame as a speaker and the latter's interest in the theory of public speaking, but he might have been apprised of the existence of Gladstone's unpublished manuscript on "Public Speaking" (January 27, 1838) which Professor Reid has edited. See Loren Reid, "Gladstone's Essay on Public Speaking," *QJS*, XXXIX (October 1953), 265-72.

[2] *The Times*, October 17, 1888, p. 7.

I say no more. . . . In regard to the questions you put to me, though I have spoken much I am not sure that I am qualified to teach even what I have practiced with some show of success.[3]

The reply to Cheeseman was similar to Bright's advice some sixteen years earlier to a young nonconformist seminarian who had asked his opinion on "the art of public speaking" and reading sermons. In this earlier letter, however, Bright concentrated more on that which directly concerned the prospective clergyman:

I have never been in the habit of writing out my speeches, certainly not for more than thirty years past. The labour of writing is bad enough, and the labour of committing to memory would be intolerable; and the speeches *read* to a meeting are not likely to be received with much favour. It is enough to think over what is to be said, and to form an outline in a few brief notes. But, first of all, a real knowledge of the subject to be spoken of is required; with that, practice, should make speaking easy.

. . . It would seem that the rules applicable to other speaking will be equally applicable to the pulpit. But in a pulpit a man is expected to speak for a given time, on a great theme, and with less of exact material than is obtainable on other occasions and ordinary subjects. And further, a majority of preachers are not very good speakers, and perhaps could not be made such. They have no natural gift for good speaking; they are not logical in mind, nor full of ideas, nor free of speech; and they have none of that natural readiness which is essential to a powerful and interesting speaker. . . . Given a man with knowledge of his subject, then I think reading a mischief; but given a man who knows little, and who has no gift of speaking, then reading seems to be inevitable, because speaking, as I deem it, is impossible. . . . Where a man can speak, let him speak—it is no doubt most effective; but where a man cannot speak, he must read. Is not this the sum of the whole matter?[4]

This advice was further clarified when he told a few friends informally:

The whole secret of effective speaking is here—of course, if you mean to speak, you first [must] know what you are going to say; and when you have resolved on that, the next point is to speak deliberately—every word, in fact every syllable, should be expressed. . . . If you do this, and if you have matter worth listening to, you will be listened to, and you will acquire a confidence and ease you won't acquire in any other way.[5]

But how well did Bright measure up to the principles of public speaking that he had outlined in these letters and remarks? An examination of the judgments and reminiscences of his contemporaries in both Liberal and Conservative party circles not only provides information on the question, but also reveals other principles which guided Bright and were not mentioned in his known letters or utterances on the subject.

Effective oratory was a useful adjunct to a successful political career in mid-nineteenth century England because speeches in Parliament and in the country were reported fully and read with great interest by a politically conscious public. Hence it was necessary for a speech to appear as good in print as when spoken, and, since this double function required quality as well as quantity, the successful politician had to devote much time to the preparation of his orations.[6] In this respect, Bright had few peers because he was able to indulge "his natural preference for *leisurely prepared* speeches, which stand as tests of literature as well as . . . oratory."[7] All who knew him intimately were impressed with the time and energy that he devoted to the preparation of the

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] H. J. Leech, ed. *The Public Letters of the Right Hon. John Bright, M.P.* (London, 1885), pp. 166-68. Although the editor did not indicate the name of the correspondent or the date of Bright's letter, it is surmised that Bright penned the reply in either December, 1873, or January, 1874.

[5] Cf. William Robertson, *Life and Times of John Bright*, 3d ed. (London, 1912), p. 387.

[6] George Macaulay Trevelyan, *The Life of John Bright*, new ed. (Boston, 1925), p. 276, hereafter cited as *Life of Bright*.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 276-77.

subject matter and choice of words for his speeches. In this direction, he adhered to the procedures and principles currently accepted by students of Speech as essential to speech preparation.

Bright prided himself on the fact that he had never made a speech for a purpose that he did not believe sound or true.[8] He insisted on the existence of a true cause for his speech because, like Gladstone, he was convinced that good "public speaking . . . embraces, and devotes the largest share of its attention to, the manner and form in which Truth is to be presented."[9] Thus together with Richard Cobden and W. J. Fox, Bright made the repeal of the Corn Laws his purpose in the early eighteen-forties and forged his public orations as the "one great political weapon" with which he could modify politics as a private citizen and public figure.[10] From that time on, his life was absorbed by his speeches and "political sermons,"[11] and he used these instruments with good effect in the great debates on the Crimean War and the electoral Reform Bills. Although his delivery often caused many of his contemporaries on both sides of the Commons to look upon him as something of an unctuous but eloquent demagogue and agitator, they did concede to him a "moral element in . . . political character which other demagogues lack."[12] They particularly respected him for an honesty of purpose which did not hesitate to put principle before class interest.[13]

Justin McCarthy relates that Bright "took no pleasure in . . . making . . . speeches except for . . . the influence he could exercise on behalf of some great cause in which he had a heartfelt interest." He never made a speech if he thought it his duty to be silent and admired the eloquence of others only if he was convinced that they were sincere. Thus while he extolled the oratorical skill of Gladstone, he deprecated what he believed was Disraeli's loquacious insincerity.[14] In this respect Bright sought to fulfill the criteria that Aristotle set for the effective orator: that a speaker must convince his audience that "he has their interests at heart" and is competent to interpret these interests because he is free from any self-seeking motives and believes in the righteousness of his

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 386.

[9] Cf. Reid, p. 267.

[10] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 4. On the partnership of Cobden and Bright in the Anti-Corn Law agitation, see S. MacCoby, *English Radicalism, 1832-1852* (London, 1935), Chap. v, hereafter cited as *Eng. Radicalism, 1832-52*; John Morley, *The Life of Richard Cobden* (Boston, 1881), pp. 129-30, 434, hereafter cited as *Life of Cobden*. Like Lord John Russell, many were convinced that, between Bright and Cobden, the former was the "stronger" of the two. A. Wyatt Tilbey, *Lord John Russell, A Study in Civil and Religious Liberty* (New York, 1931), p. 191; J. A. Spender, *The Public Life* (London, 1925), I, 46; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 62, 97-98.

[11] Charles McLaren, "Reminiscences of John Bright," *The North American Review*, CLV (September 1892), 323, hereafter cited as "Reminiscences." (McLaren was Bright's nephew.) Palmerston regarded Cobden and Bright as "displeasing mixtures of the bagman and the preacher" in politics. Cf. John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (New York, 1911), I, 367, hereafter cited as *Gladstone;* see also Spender, I, 46.

[12] Cf. David Spring, "Earl Fitzwilliam and the Corn Laws," *The American Historical Review*, LIX (January 1954), 294; George W. E. Russell, *Portraits of the Seventies* (New York, n.d.), pp. 171, 174; Justin McCarthy, *A History of Our Own Times from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of 1880* (New York, 1894), II, 139, hereafter cited as *Our Own Times;* S. MacCoby, *English Radicalism, 1853-1886* (London, 1938), pp. 74n., 76, hereafter cited as *Eng. Radicalism, 1853-86;* Carl Evans Boyd, "John Bright," *The Chautauquan*, XXVIII (March 1899), 544; E. L. Woodward, *The Age of Reform, 1815-1870* (Oxford, 1938), pp. 115-16.

[13] John W. Dodd, *The Age of Paradox, A Biography of England, 1841-1851* (New York, 1952), p. 206; Esmé Wingfield-Stratford, *Those Earnest Victorians* (New York, 1930), pp. 272-73; Goldwin Smith, *Reminiscences* (New York, 1910), p. 239, hereafter cited as *Reminiscences.*

[14] Justin McCarthy, *Portraits of the Sixties* (New York, 1903), pp. 76, 78-79, hereafter cited as *Portraits.*

cause.[15] But Bright was also aware that prudent silence often accomplishes the same purpose. Consequently, when explaining to a friend his silence after leaving the Gladstone Ministry in 1882, he averred that his "language and purpose would be misunderstood, and wrong motives . . . attributed to [him]" if he declared himself on what he considered to be the mistakes of his late colleagues and personal friends.[16]

On the other hand, he spoke out eloquently even when he knew that he was defying the tide of public sentiment. At no time was this more apparent than in the period immediately preceding and during the Crimean War, when his brave opposition to the pro-war element illustrated the depth of his Quaker pacificism (and the height of his militant pugnacity) in defence of his convictions.[17] Risking the support of his constituents and his "trusty middle and industrious classes," and ignoring Cobden's efforts to restrain him, he furiously attacked the Government's war policy and drew down upon Cobden and himself a storm of popular abuse "hardly equalled before in English political life. . . ."[18] But the price he paid for the "vehement political anger" which inspired some of the finest speeches of his career was a nervous collapse in January, 1856, and a humiliating defeat at the polls in Manchester during the following year.[19] His influence and political career seemed shattered beyond repair. Yet he regained his popularity and reentered Parliament in 1858, espousing the cause of the working class "radicals" in their fight for the electoral franchise.[20] This uphill fight, distinguished by the brilliant oratorical campaign of 1858-1859 and crowned by his triumphant return to Parliament (even as an alleged radical "agitator"), seemed to Bright's contemporaries "almost like a resurrection" from the dead.[21]

Some of Bright's greatest orations were fired by his sympathy for the Union cause during the Civil War and his ad-

[15] See Joseph Sturge's introduction in Ernest Rhys, ed. *Selected Speeches of the Right Hon. John Bright, M.P., on Public Questions* (London, 1907), p. xi.

[16] John Bright to Moncure D. Conway, April 9, 1885, in "A Letter of John Bright," *The Nation*, LXXX (March 30, 1905), 246. Bright resigned largely because of his inability to accept Gladstone's Egyptian policy.

[17] John MacCunn, *Six Radical Thinkers. Bentham, J. S. Mill, Cobden, Carlyle, Mazzini, T. H. Green* (London, 1910), p. 239; Russell, p. 172; Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 239; Boyd, p., 544. Bright even frightened Cobden by his "indiscreet pugnacity . . . in handling his critics and opponents." (See letter of Richard Cobden to the Reverend Henry Richard, December 9, 1854, in William Harbutt Dawson, *Richard Cobden and Foreign Policy* (London, 1926), p. 115; J. A. Hobson, *Richard Cobden. The International Man* (New York, 1919), p. 109.) On the other hand, Goldwin Smith believed that though Bright was "combative," he never lost his balance. (Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 239.) However, Professor Ensor was less charitable in asserting that Bright, in opposing the Crimean War, put "considerations of trade before considerations of the hour." He is convinced that while Bright's hatred of war was not based upon naked self-interest, its effect on the "carpet trade" disturbed him. (Ensor, p. 251 and note.)

[18] Hobson, p. 108; Dawson, pp. 78, 115, 217; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 482-83; Spender, I, 50; MacCoby, *Eng. Radicalism, 1853-86*, p. 33. On Bright's opposition to the Government's Enlistment Bill, see Philip Morrell, ed. *Leaves from the Greville Diary* (London, 1929), pp. 722, 787, hereafter cited as *Greville Diary*; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 218.

[19] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 49, 53-54, 98; Morley, *Life of Cobden*, p. 130; Hobson, pp. 172, 193, 207. One of these orations was the famous "Angel of Death" speech. Cf. *Greville Diary*, p. 736.

[20] S. MacCoby, ed. *The English Radical Tradition, 1763-1914* (London, 1952), pp. 146-47, hereafter cited as *Rad. Tradition;* MacCoby, *Eng. Radicalism, 1853-86*, pp. 69-70.

[21] McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, II, 139. McCarthy was convinced that Bright was basically a conservative and far less "radical" than Cobden. (*Ibid.*, p. 149.) Bright was nothing of an extremist in his political views and like the English bourgeoisie drew a strong line between reform and revolution. (Cf. McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 84.) It is also interesting to note that he had bitterly opposed Lord Ashley's factory reforms. (Dodd, p. 159; Spender, II, 25; Ensor, pp. 115-16.) Yet, he was most sincere in seeking the vote for the working class. (Wingfield-Stratford, pp. 272-73.)

miration for Lincoln.[22] But although he was greatly incensed with the Foreign Office's equivocal policy toward the Union in 1864, he maintained at that time a prudent silence in order to prevent his strong convictions from giving way to an attack which might have brought down his party's Government and thus have prejudiced his hopes for further electoral reform. When the victory of the Union and the death of his arch-foe, Palmerston,[23] gave the signal for another era of reform, Bright prodded Gladstone to introduce a moderate bill for the enfranchisement of urban workingmen and immediately immersed himself in a fierce campaign for the reform bill. In his impassioned "Cave of Adullam" speech, he excoriated the recalcitrants among the Liberals who opposed the measure.[24] Even though these Adullamites and the Tories finally killed Gladstone's bill, Bright saw his crusade bear fruit in Disraeli's far-reaching Reform Bill of 1867. During the great agitation which preceded this victory, Bright aroused even the admiration of Gladstone, who, although disliking the substance of Bright's speeches, praised him for his "admirable combination of discretion and loyalty."[25] What was considered even more remarkable about Bright's stand was the fact that "he . . . put principle before [his] class" in agitating for an extension of the franchise "that was to break down the power of the bourgeoisie. . . ."[26] Yet the success of this policy was evident when the new electorate responded by providing a resounding victory for the Liberals in 1868 and by securing the inclusion of Bright in the Government as President of the Board of Trade.

The fight for the Second Reform Bill marked the summit of Bright's oratorical campaigns. Exertion and age began to show their toll as he mellowed and became less active.[27] After illness had forced him to leave the Gladstone Government in 1870, he contented himself with the "tranquil life" of the Commons, stirring only in the late seventies to make speeches in behalf of British non-intervention in the Russo-Turkish War and to keep alive agitation for the enfranchisement of farm laborers.[28] Thus he wrote apologetically to a friend: "I cannot fight as I did twenty-four years ago. I can only protest and submit."[29]

Bright even excelled Gladstone in his

[22] Cf. F. W. Hirst, *Early Life and Letters of John Morley* (London, 1927), I, 104; "War-Time Letters from John Bright to William H. Aspinwall of Rockwood, N. Y.," *The Atlantic Monthly*, LXXVI (December 1895), 852-54; Hobson, p. 364. See also Frank Moore, ed. *Speeches of John Bright, M.P., on the American Question* (Boston, 1865), *passim;* John Bright to John Lathrop Motley, July 31, 1865. George William Curtis, ed. *The Correspondence of John Lathrop Motley* (New York, 1889), II, 206, hereafter cited as *Correspondence of Motley;* Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 98.

[23] Cf. McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 321; Morley, *Gladstone*, I, 367.

[24] The Cave of Adullam, near the Canaanitish city of Adullam southwest of Jerusalem, was the refuge of David fleeing from the wrath of Saul. Cf. 1 Samuel 22; 2 Samuel 23: 13-17. See also Keith Feiling, *A History of England from the Coming of the English to 1938* (London, 1948), p. 935; Sir Spencer Walpole, *The Life of Lord John Russell* (London, 1889), II, 411; William Flavelle Monypenny and George Marle Buckle, *The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield* (New York, 1929), II, 164.

[25] Morley, *Gladstone*, II, 201, 223. See also MacCoby, *Rad. Tradition*, p. 92.

[26] Wingfield-Stratford, pp. 272-73.

[27] Morley, *Gladstone*, II, 417; Russell, p. 178.

[28] W. T. Stead, ed. *The M.P. for Russia. Reminiscences and Correspondence of Madame Olga Novikoff* (London, 1909), I, 254, 258, 350, hereafter cited as *Correspondence of Madame Novikoff;* MacCoby, *Eng. Radicalism, 1853-86*, p. 225.

[29] John Bright to Madame Olga Novikoff, April 26, 1878. *Correspondence of Madame Novikoff*, I, 486. This letter was written at the height of the Anglo-Russian crisis over the Eastern Question, and Bright was referring to his stand against the Crimean War twenty-four years before. In 1882, he left Gladstone's Cabinet rather than speak out against the Government's Egyptian policy and its attitude toward Irish Home Rule. (McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 85; Boyd, p. 541.) Bright's last speech was delivered at a banquet in honor of Joseph Chamberlain on March 28, 1888. He died a year later. Robertson, pp. 390-91.

analysis of the audience and occasion in public speaking.[30] Thus he developed two distinct styles of oratory, one for use in the Commons, and the other for the public platform.[31] But no matter what the audience or occasion, he possessed the happy faculty of imparting interest to even the driest subject and of exercising a masterful command of his listeners. Like Gladstone, he placed great emphasis on audience contact, but unlike Gladstone, he concentrated more on extemporaneous public speaking than formal debate.[32] Hence he developed "an instinct for publicity which was positive genius" and seldom made a speech unless on some important and well-timed occasion.[33] "His speeches . . . seemed to come at exactly the right moment and the pauses between them [were] beautifully timed . . ." because, above all, "he understood and appreciated the *value* of his own speeches. . . ."[34] Yet he regarded them with no excessive pride.

Simplicity of manner, colorful and happy illustration, forcefulness and poise, were the all-important elements in Bright's speaking.[35] On the public platform as in the Commons, his oratorical style was singularly free from over-elaboration, pomposity, and long-windedness, because, as he confessed, of his "compassion" for his listeners.[36] The Tory leader, Lord Salisbury, was convinced that the secret of Bright's power over audiences was the "homely simplicity" of his speeches and their great appeal "to the popular heart. . . ."[37] Bright's graphic plainness was reinforced by a "homeliness of allusion" and imagery[38] which enabled him to dominate his audience. He was a master at using the "bell-like clearness" of his voice and intonation to convey the most subtle meanings and "every mood of the human spirit. . . ."[39] He could move with grace from an easy, conversational, and humorous manner to the hard-hitting fighter's vehement tones of irony and scorn, pathos, and invective, to suit the occasion.[40] Yet Justin McCarthy personally observed:

> His voice was for the most part, calm and measured; he hardly ever indulged in much gesticulation. He never . . . shouted or stormed. The fire of his eloquence was a white-heat, consuming, but never sparkling or sputtering.[41]

Bright's ability to excite and awe his listeners by "the faculty of keeping all his other faculties in poise"[42] belied an inner turbulence and deep sensitivity to his milieu. The square-jawed and resolute countenance, with its aura of strength and earnestness, masked a nervousness which was more apparent in the Commons than on the public platform.[43] He was never cowed by a hostile

[30] McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 79.

[31] Spender, I, 54; Robertson, p. 381.

[32] Cf. Reid, pp. 265, 267-72ff.

[33] Spender, I, 53. See Goldwin Smith on Bright's keen insight in "political character and tendency." Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 242; also McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 75.

[34] Spender, I, 53; McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 78.

[35] Cf. Viscount Gladstone, *After Thirty Years* (London, 1929), p. 189; Robertson, p. 377; Boyd, p. 544; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 319; Motley to Mrs. John Lathrop Motley, June 13, 1858. *Correspondence of Motley*, I, 262; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 86; Spender, I, 53-54.

[36] Russell, p. 176; R. A. J. Walling, ed. *The Diaries of John Bright* (New York, 1931), p. 156, hereafter cited as *Bright's Diaries*.

[37] Lord Salisbury quoted in Boyd, p. 544.

[38] Morley, *Life of Cobden*, p. 129; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 316; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 381.

[39] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 1; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229. Louis Blanc, the French Socialist, declared that Bright's enunciations "sound to the charge, ringing like the blast of a bugle." N. C. Tyler, "John Bright as an Orator, Part II," *The Nation*, IV (June 13, 1867), 478, hereafter cited as "Bright, Part II." See also Russell, p. 176; Spender, I, 54.

[40] Motley to Mrs. John Lathrop Motley, June 13, 1858. *Correspondence of Motley*, I, 262; Gladstone, p. 189; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 231; Woodward, p. 115; Russell, p. 181.

[41] McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229.

[42] Tyler, "Bright, Part II," p. 477.

[43] Motley to Miss Lily Motley, July 22, 1867. *Correspondence of Motley*, II, 372; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 318; Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 239; Robertson, pp. 381, 385.

audience because he relied upon a strong appearance, "the spell of his words, the note of persuasion, and even prayer in the voice," to hush the belligerent assembly.[44]

Although contemporaries agree that Bright was a better orator than Gladstone in the Commons,[45] they are also in accord that Gladstone was the better tactician. Bright, often carried away by "vehement political anger, and . . . a wrath as stern as that of an ancient prophet . . . ," was too blunt to suit many of his parliamentary colleagues.[46] Then, too, beneath the brave exterior and appearance of "superb self-restraint" was a "thin-skinned" man who ruffled more than he chose to admit or show.[47] Thus, during a debate in the Commons over the Irish Church in 1868, Disraeli's irony provoked Bright "to lose all command over himself, and to use language which . . . brought to an end the . . . [long standing] private friendship which had existed [between the two men]."[48] Yet Bright's ability attractively to reinforce reason with the passion of moral indignation, matched by a thoroughly human wit (even when handling an opponent), contributed to his stature as "a parliamentary tactician and debater of no mean power."[49] With Gladstone, Bright was rated as one of the only two men in Parliament whose eloquence actually changed votes.[50] He was less instructive but certainly more appealing in his speeches than Gladstone because, as Bright readily admitted, he had no "talent" for detail and merely charted his course "from headland to headland through the great seas" of words.[51]

Bright so carefully narrowed his subject that when he had finished a speech the audience was left with the feeling that they would want to hear more on the topic.[52] This was not easy for a man who freely confessed that it was most difficult for him to speak briefly. "[I] am certain," he wrote, "it does not arise from love of it—rather, I suspect, from full acquaintance with the subjects discussed and anxiety to state the case so fully as to convince. . . ."[53] Yet it was this mastery of his material that enabled Bright to touch "with a broad hand" and give life to cold statistics and involved subjects.[54]

The meticulous preparation of subject matter was inspired by Bright's resolve "to abstain from speaking on subjects which [he] had not examined and well considered . . ." and by a disdain for "flimsy" speakers.[55] In spite of a tendency toward indolence, he devoted time and energy without stint to gathering the facts which embellished his speeches.[56] His fondness for the Bible,

[44] Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 239; Morley, *Gladstone*, I, 257; Spender, I, 54-55; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 385.

[45] Motley to Mrs. John Lathrop Motley, June 13, 1858. *Correspondence of Motley*, I, 262; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 378; Spender, I, 54. See also Disraeli's statement as cited in Monypenny and Buckle, I, 1416.

[46] Morley, *Life of Cobden*, p. 130; Monypenny and Buckle, I, 1416.

[47] McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229; Lord Granville to Gladstone, May 26, 1869, cited in Morley, *Gladstone*, II, 283; McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 83.

[48] Monypenny and Buckle, II, 376.

[49] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 97, 378. See also Motley to Mrs. John Lathrop Motley, June 13, 1858, *Correspondence of Motley*, I, 262.

[50] See Sturge in Rhys, p. x.

[51] McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 319.

[52] Robertson, p. 384.

[53] *Bright's Diaries*, p. 156.

[54] McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 319; Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 223.

[55] See Bright's statement (November, 1868) cited in Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 386 (also Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 238) and Bright's estimate of Mark Twain, December 2, 1874. *Bright's Diaries*, p. 359.

[56] Goldwin Smith mused that Bright did not read much beyond the material for his speeches. (Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 240.) Justin McCarthy confirms Smith's opinion on the breadth of Bright's reading. Cf. McCarthy, *Portraits*, p. 81. See also Spender, I, 54, 55; George Barnett Smith, *The Life and Speeches of the Right Honourable John Bright, M.P.* (New York, 1881), hereafter cited as *Speeches of John Bright*. Since Bright furnished the

Dante, Milton, and Byron,[57] as well-springs of moral strength, made these sources contribute to the material as well as the spiritual and poetic force of his oratory. But the conviction that "the best prophet of the future is the past,"[58] led him to draw upon history for the precedents, facts, and ideas with which to clothe his speeches. His freedom from the duties and responsibilities that occupied such parliamentary colleagues as Gladstone gave him the leisure for research to perfect his eloquence.[59] Thus, he was always at his best in premeditated speeches.[60]

Bright's early efforts at public speaking consisted of carefully composed and memorized speeches.[61] His "fear of failure" caused him to write out his arguments, illustrations, and perorations in the form of elaborate notes;[62] but, as he later related, "I suffered so much that I resolved never again to write and commit to memory another speech, a resolution to which I have adhered. . . ."[63] However, it took him four or five years to abandon the practice of reading prepared and "artificially . . . polished" speeches.[64] By the beginning of his oratorical campaign in behalf of the Anti-Corn Law League in the eighteen-forties, he had already developed the practice of "writing out only the heads of his argument, interspersed with an occasional 'key sentence,' and ending up with the peroration transcribed in full."[65] Yet, although he continued to transcribe the peroration with great care, it was frequently delivered extemporaneously.[66] The perorations, as well as the "heads of argument," with key sentences or ideas and quotations were fully recorded on small sheafs of notepaper of equal size which he casually dropped into his tall hat as he spoke.[67] More than often, he would depart from his notes "following new lines of thought, catching his inspiration as he went along, stopping always before it was exhausted, and through all keeping his . . . finger on the pulse of his hearers."[68] His best speeches were always those distinguished by a "quiet argument beautifully *arranged* and conveyed . . . in the simplest of Anglo-Saxon words."[69]

A keen appreciation of the value and rhythm of words and sentences was Bright's forte.[70] Hence contemporaries were in unanimous agreement that his attempts to set a high standard of lan-

notes for Smith's work, it can be considered semi-autobiographical. See Bright's entry for February 6, 1881, in *Bright's Diaries*, p. 456.

[57] *Bright's Diaries*, pp. 17, 19, 20, 300, 304, 316, 471n; Smith, *Reminiscences*, pp. 239, 240; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229; Sturge in Rhys, p. xi; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 319; Woodward, p. 116; Robertson, pp. 385, 382.

[58] Bright cited in Robertson, p. 382.

[59] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 98, 384.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 381. See also Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 238.

[61] *Bright's Diaries*, p. 52; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 25.

[62] *Bright's Diaries*, p. 72; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 316.

[63] *Bright's Diaries*, p. 52. In this direction, Trevelyan and Robertson relate that Bright discontinued writing out and memorizing speeches on the advice of a Baptist minister, the Reverend John Aldis. The clergyman claimed that he told Bright in 1832 that "it would be best not to burden the memory too much, but having carefully prepared and committed any portions when special effect was desired, merely to put down other things in the desired order, leaving the wording of them to the moment." (See Aldis' statement as cited in Robertson, pp. 25-26; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 26.) Bright, however, made no mention of this in his published diaries and Trevelyan quoted Bright as having declared that he did not quite remember Aldis' advice. He averred that he had discontinued the old practice of reading from a prepared speech because "it had cost me so much in preparation and anxiety. . . ." Cf. Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 26-27.

[64] McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 316.

[65] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 27, 273n; Spender, I, 54-55; Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 238; Tyler, "Bright, Part II," p. 437.

[66] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 384.

[67] Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 238; Spender, I, 54-55; Robertson, pp. 375, 381; Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 385, 385n.

[68] Spender, I, 55. See also Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 238; Smith, *Speeches of John Bright*, p. 365.

[69] Spender, I, 54. My italics.

[70] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 384.

guage for himself, without degenerating to "the stilted abstractions of rhetoric"[71] so common to many of his parliamentary colleagues, helped make his speeches first rate literature in the English language.[72] In later life he wrote that if his speeches were considered good literature it was because he had been inspired by good literary models. He elaborated on his definition of good models and outlined his formula in the choice of words by saying:

> It is a good thing to use few words and the best words, which are those which are simple and forcible, with no needless use of adjectives, too many of which spoil speaking and writing. *To assist in attaining to a practice like this, the reading of books—I mean well-written books—is helpful, so that the eye and the ear and the mind may become familiar with good language.*[73]

Simplicity of language through the use of single-syllable words of graphic power to convey "clear and convincing expressions of thought" and to "marshall facts into a logical and irrefutable structure of evidence . . ." marked Bright's greatest speeches.[74] His words, devoid as they were of erudite foreignisms, of "bombast and slang," were in harmony with his vibrant voice and contributed to the development of a style at once "racy, strong, sharp, terse, clear, with a basis of . . . [pure English] . . . and just enough . . . courtly Norman to give it elevation, nobleness, and . . . majesty. . . ."[75] But his choice of words was colored by his strong dependence upon Scriptural imagery; and his style, by his dependence upon Milton.[76] These influences, supplemented by a deep aesthetic appreciation of poetry and "his vision of homely, common life . . . [as] . . . the source of high thoughts and imagings," inspired the finest passages of his orations and the rich and energetic sentences with which he closed his speeches.[77] Thus he was able "to clothe his sentiments in *language* that went at once to the understanding and the heart."[78]

To Bright effective speaking was not just a natural gift but something that could be developed. Although he would go from platform to platform "trusting to the moment for inspiration and words," his fluency was the result of the practice which he devoted to his orations.[79] He tried hard to overcome the tremulousness which plagued him before delivering speeches and finally confessed to Goldwin Smith that "after all his practice and success he never got over his nervousness . . . and [his] knees shook under him when he rose to speak."[80] He undoubtedly surmounted this inner turmoil more than he realized or chose to admit. His ultimate mastery of it was perhaps evident in the "low, quiet force" which distinguished the *beginning* of his speeches and which grad-

[71] Morley, *Life of Cobden*, p. 129; Tyler, "Bright, Part II," p. 437.

[72] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 25; Russell, pp. 175-76; Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 238. See also Sturge in Rhys, p. x; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 316; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229. Spender wrote that although Bright had contempt for classical studies, "his own style was classical and . . . more fastidious in its use and choice of words than that of any of his contemporaries" who had been "brought up" on the classics. Spender, I, 54.

[73] See Bright's statement in Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, p. 25. My italics.

[74] Sturge in Rhys, p. x. See also Spender, I, 53; Smith, *Speeches of John Bright*, pp. 365-66; Morley, *Life of Cobden*, p. 129; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229; Dodd, p. 206; J. E. Thorold Rogers' evaluation in John Bright and J. E. Thorold Rogers, eds. *Speeches on Questions of Public Policy by Richard Cobden, M.P.*, 3d ed. (London, 1908), I, 316.

[75] McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229; McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 319; Spender, I, 54; Tyler, "Bright, Part II," p. 437.

[76] Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 239; McCarthy, *Our Own Times*, I, 229; Smith, *Speeches of John Bright*, p. 365.

[77] Trevelyan, *Life of Bright*, pp. 384-85; Tyler, "Bright, Part II," p. 437.

[78] Robertson, p. 376. My italics.

[79] Spender, I, 53.

[80] Smith, *Reminiscences*, p. 239. McLaren wrote that "he was nervous, anxious and irritable until his work was done." McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 318.

ually gathered volume as he went along,[81] until he lost himself in what he was saying. Thus he kept his delivery deliberately calm and avoided gesticulation and during "his most powerful passages appeared as if he were rather keeping in his strength than taxing it with effort."[82] His enunciation was measured and distinct; and "the cadences, the pauses, the climaxes [of his language] all belong to the . . . art" which he assiduously perfected.[83] But "when his speech was over, he was happy and sympathetic as a child"[84] who had overcome or avoided a real or fancied ordeal.

An awareness of the potentialities of his splendidly endowed voice and practice in its use enabled Bright to develop a fluency which was at once clear, resonant, and "exquisitely modulated."[85] The fact that he could make himself heard in the largest hall at a great distance was not only due to the natural compass of his voice, but also to the development of a stance in which he held his head more backward than erect.[86] He was thus able to harmonize purity of language and a rich voice with a natural poise to attain with great effect the dramatic power which "magnetized" his audience.

While it is academic to agree with the verdict that "it is doubtful whether English public life has ever produced a man more possessed of the *qualifications* of a great orator than Bright,"[87] I believe it true that in practicing his highest art he lived up to what he preached. It is perhaps within this frame of reference that he made some of his greatest contributions not only to public speaking but also to English politics.

[81] Robertson, p. 375.
[82] Smith, *Reminiscences,* p. 238; McCarthy, *Our Own Times,* I, 229.
[83] Spender, I, 54; Smith, *Reminiscences,* p. 239.
[84] McLaren, "Reminiscences," p. 318.
[85] McCarthy, *Our Own Times,* I, 229; Smith, *Speeches of John Bright,* p. 365.
[86] Smith, *Reminiscences,* p. 239; Robertson, pp. 375-76.
[87] McCarthy, *Our Own Times,* I, 228. My italics.

BEECHER IN ENGLAND

We have Mr. Beecher in this country; he has made some noble speeches in defense of his country, and I think has done great good. His speech in London, a few days ago, was grand, and the meeting one likely to have a great effect. Our newspapers are more moderate in tone of late, and as you advance towards your final success we shall see a change of opinion among all those who address the public from the press or the platform.

I am told there is some news this morning, but I have not seen it yet; we get no telegraphic news at this quiet seaside place. After next week we hope again to be at home at Rochdale.

I am anxious to hear from Chattanooga and from Charleston. It is wonderful how the attention of all England is centred on the news from your country.

With best wishes for your cause, and thanks for your remembrance of me,

I am very truly yours,

John Bright.

John Bright to William H. Aspinwall,
The Atlantic Monthly, LXXVI (December 1895), 854.

THE FORUM

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago
December 27-30, 1954

The Speech Association of America transacted the following items of business:

Braden moved that the Executive Secretary be authorized by the Council to make a contract with University Microfilms to microfilm issues of the *QJS* before 1921. Aly seconded. Passed.

Rousse moved that the Executive Secretary be given discretionary power in granting the distinction of honorary membership. Auer seconded. Cortright moved to amend the motion to read that honorary membership should be given to those persons who have been members for twenty years; and if, in the judgment of the Executive Secretary, exception seemed to merit it, power to grant membership should be vested in the Executive Secretary, President, and Executive Vice-President. The amendment was seconded and passed. The motion as amended was passed.

The reports of the Project Committee on the Volume of Studies in the Colonial Period of American Public Address and of the Study Committee on the History of American Public Address were made by Bohman. Bohman moved that a subcommittee of the Committee on the History of American Public Address—Dickey, Braden, Auer, Perkins—be constituted as a project committee for a volume on Southern Speaking, 1820-1860. McBurney seconded. Passed.

The report of the Finance Committee was submitted by McBurney. The Committee proposed that the Association undertake the publication of the bibliography on American preaching by Harry Caplan. The proposal was that it be done on a contractual basis at an approximate cost to the Association of $300.00.

Hance moved that the 1962 Convention be held on October 24, 25, 26, and 27 in Cleveland, Ohio. Freeley seconded. Aly moved to amend the motion by deferring selection of the 1962 convention date until after the 1957 Convention in Boston. Hahn seconded. The motion was defeated. Cortright offered the substitute motion that the Association meet in 1962 in Denver in the next to the last week in August. Dickey seconded. The motion was defeated. Bagwell proposed the substitute motion to meet in Cleveland in December instead of October, 1962. Miller seconded. Rousse amended the substitute motion by proposing that the meeting be held during Thanksgiving holidays instead of Christmas holidays. Davison seconded. The amendment was defeated. The substitute motion was defeated. Aly moved that the Committee on Time and Place be authorized to negotiate for a Convention in Chicago at Christmas time in 1962. The motion was seconded and defeated. Phillips moved to return the matter to the Committee on Time and Place to decide where the August meeting should be held. Freeley seconded. The motion was defeated. Miller moved to amend the original motion (to meet in Cleveland on October 24, 25, 26, and 27 in 1962) by providing for a meeting in Cleveland in December, 1962. Aly seconded. Miller accepted an addition to his motion to meet in Denver in 1963 in August. The revised motion was passed.

Gilman moved that the Executive Council approve in principle the setting up of regional depositories in addition to a central depository for SAA archives—provided that the principle of SAA direction and jurisdiction over any and all such depositories be maintained. The motion was seconded and approved.

The report of the Committee on Archives was made by Cowperthwaite. Rousse moved that the Committee be continued indefinitely in order that it may (1) continue with the long-time project of locating and identifying potentially suitable archive materials, and (2) act as the executive agent of SAA in making arrangements for a suitable depository or depositories for SAA archives. Morley seconded. Passed.

Kramer reported for the Committee on Revision of the Constitution. After an explanation of the purposes, structure, and benefits of the new document, Kramer moved the adoption of the Constitution as published in the October issue of the *QJS* and the November issue of *The Speech Teacher* with the revisions that have been made at this Convention. Gil-

man seconded. Larson moved to amend the proposed Constitution by striking out the word "Executive" before "Council" and substituting the word "Administrative." Rousse seconded. Passed. Garff Wilson moved that, in all places where the phrase "Area Group" appears, the phrase "Interest Group" be substituted. Dow seconded. Passed. After discussion, the Constitution was passed unanimously. Utterback moved that the group go on record for a vote of thanks to the Committee on Structure and the Committee on Revision of the Constitution. Gilman seconded. Passed.

Bagwell reported for the Committee on Public Relations. Bagwell moved that the Council go on record as favoring the giving of suitable awards in the name of the Association to persons, groups of persons, and/or organizations outside the Association who in some way or various ways have rendered meritorious service to our profession or who have advanced greatly the purposes of the Association as set forth in Article II of the Constitution, or who exemplify high standards of performance in the various speech arts. Davison seconded. Passed. Bagwell moved the formation of an *ad hoc* Committee on Awards with the responsibility of studying this matter and drawing up a set of recommendations to be presented at the Convention in Los Angeles in 1955. Kendall seconded. Passed.

Chairman Miller reported for the Committee on Resolutions. The following resolutions were submitted:

(1) *Whereas* the Federal Communications Commission has allocated television channels for the exclusive use of educational institutions; and

Whereas numerous members of the Speech Association of America are engaged in activities designed to promote public enlightenment by means of television; and

Whereas educational television has already proved to be a potent force in the educational life of the communities in which it has been established; and

Whereas the potentialities of the medium for the expansion of education in an unprecedented manner are undoubtedly very great;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Speech Association is on record as being in favor of the establishment of the greatest possible number of educational television stations consistent with the demonstrated ability of educational organizations to utilize those channels.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be presented to the Federal Communications Commission.

Miller moved the adoption of this resolution and the Committee seconded. Passed.

(2) *Whereas,* Professor Lew Sarett was a founder of the Speech Association of America; and

Whereas, he rendered long and excellent service to the field of speech;

Be it resolved that we express our sorrow at his death and extend our condolences to his family and his many friends.

Miller moved the adoption of this resolution and the Committee seconded. Passed.

(3) *Be it resolved* by the 1954 Convention of the Speech Association of America:

(a) That our appreciation be extended to the management and staff of the Conrad Hilton Hotel for providing excellent facilities for our meetings and for the very fine service to members of the Association;

(b) That our appreciation be extended to all members of the SAA Convention local arrangement committees for their time and effort and in particular our thanks to the chairmen of these committees: Glen E. Mills, General Chairman, and Virginia Rutherford, Robert Martin, William Haney, William Wayne Johnson, Bess Sondel, Austin Freeley, Dean C. Barnlund, and Wanda B. Mitchell;

(c) That our sincere appreciation for their faithful and devoted service to the Association be extended to those national officers who have concluded their terms of service at this Convention or during the past year: Karl R. Wallace, President; Paul Bagwell, Executive Vice-President; Elva Van Haitsma, Second Vice-President; Orville A. Hitchcock, Executive Secretary; Dallas Dickey, Editor of *The Speech Teacher;*

(d) That our appreciation be extended to previous Committees on Structure and to the present Committee on Revision of the Constitution;

(e) That our appreciation be extended to Henry L. Mueller for his valuable assistance at this Convention to the Association and its Committee on Revision of the Constitution;

(f) That we commend the Committee on Background Studies in the History of Speech Education in America as well as the contributors to the volume, and also the publisher of the volume, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Miller moved the adoption of this resolution and the Committee seconded. Passed.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Speech Association of America submits the following nominations for election to office at the 1955 annual meeting:

For President: Lester Thonssen, College of the City of New York

(As First Vice-President, Professor Thonssen succeeds to the presidency under the provisions of the Constitution of the SAA.)

For First Vice-President: Loren D. Reid, University of Missouri

For Second Vice-President: Elise Hahn, University of California at Los Angeles

For Members of the Executive Council:

Barnard Hewitt, University of Illinois
T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama
Evelyn Konigsberg, Bureau of Speech Improvement for the City of New York
Clarence T. Simon, Northwestern University

Respectfully submitted:

Bower Aly
Lionel Crocker
Kenneth G. Hance
Orville A. Hitchcock
W. Norwood Brigance, *Chairman*

OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA FOR 1955

(The chairman of each committee is named first, except where special arrangements are indicated. Members ex officio are listed in italics.)

I. Advisory Committees

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: *Thomas Rousse, J. Jeffery Auer, Waldo W. Braden, Kenneth G. Hance, Wilbur S. Howell, Henry Mueller, Susie S. Niles, Lester Thonssen, Karl Wallace.*

FINANCE: James H. McBurney, Chairman (July 1, 1954-June 30, 1955), Orville Hitchcock, Loren Reid, Chairman (July 1, 1955-June 30, 1956), *Waldo W. Braden.*

PUBLICATIONS: W. M. Sattler, Barnet Baskerville, Elise Hahn, William McCoard, Frank Whiting, *J. Jeffery Auer, Waldo W. Braden, Kenneth G. Hance, Wilbur S. Howell, Henry Mueller, Thomas Rousse.*

TIME AND PLACE: Rupert Cortright, Milton Dickens, Kenneth G. Hance, Elbert Harrington, Barnard Hewitt, *Waldo W. Braden.*

PUBLIC RELATIONS: Kenneth G. Hance, Paul Bagwell, Upton Palmer, *Waldo W. Braden, Thomas Rousse.*

COMMITTEE ON POLICY: Horace Rahskopf, H. P. Constans, Lionel Crocker, Wilbur Gilman, James H. McBurney, Karl Wallace.

II. Co-ordinating Committees

COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SAA AND OTHER RELATED ORGANIZATIONS: Lester Thonssen, Delwin Dusenbury, Austin Freeley, Elwood Murray, Robert Schacht, Jesse Villarreal.

COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SAA AND REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS: Kenneth G. Hance, and the Presidents of CSSA, WSSA, SSA, SAES, PSA.

III. Service Committees

CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADDRESS: A. Craig Baird, John W. Bachman, Halbert Gulley, Robert C. Jeffrey, Theodore Kennedy, Cullen Owens, Hardy Perritt, Charles Redding, Eugene White, Thomas Daly (Consultant, *Vital Speeches*).

INTERCOLLEGIATE DISCUSSION AND DEBATE: R. G. Gunderson will be the SAA representative to January 1, 1956. The other members of the committee are representatives from TKA, PKD, DSR, and PRP. The chairmanship rotates.

TEACHING SPEECH TO FOREIGN STUDENTS: Ivan Putnam, Jr., James Abel, Gifford Blyton, Albert T. Cordray, Eva Currie, Henry Moser.

INTERNATIONAL DISCUSSION AND DEBATE: Annabel Dunham Hagood, Paul Carmack, Gordon Hostettler, Alan Nichols, Brooks Quimby, Franklin R. Shirley, Mildred E. Adams (Consultant, Institute on International Education).

COMMITTEE ON DISCUSSION AND GROUP METHODS: Carroll C. Arnold, Martin Anderson, Dean Barnlund, Henry Ewbank, Sr., Kim Giffin, Franklyn S. Haiman, Russell Jenkins, John Keltner, N. Edd Miller, Helen Schrader, William Utterback.

COMMITTEE ON ARCHIVES: L. Leroy Cowperthwaite, J. Jeffery Auer, Earl Wiley, *Waldo Braden.*

COMMITTEE ON RECRUITMENT AND SUPPLY: Loren Reid, Barbara Dodson, Evelyn Konigsberg, Wilson Paul, David C. Phillips, Karl Robinson, Hugh Seabury.

IV. Study Committees

HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION: Edyth Renshaw, Clarence Edney, Douglas Ehninger, Bert Emsley, Giles W. Gray, Clifford E. Hamar, Donald K. Smith.

HISTORY OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: George V. Bohman, J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, W. Norwood Brigance, Donald C. Bryant, Rob-

ert D. Clark, Laura Crowell, Dallas C. Dickey, J. Garber Drushal, H. L. Ewbank, Sr., Robert G. Gunderson, Marie K. Hochmuth, Lindsey S. Perkins, Hollis L. White, Ernest J. Wrage.

PROBLEMS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: John J. Pruis, Jean Conyers Ervin, Geraldine Garrison, Elise Hahn, Zelda Horner Kosh, Mardel Ogilvie, Mary Elizabeth Peebles, C. Agnes Rigney.

PROBLEMS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL: Evelyn Konigsberg, Charles L. Balcer, Mary Blackburn, Hayden K. Carruth, Lawrence S. Jenness, Freda Kenner, Yetta Mitchell, Oliver W. Nelson, Bea Olmstead, Waldo W. Phelps, Mrs. O. J. Whitworth.

PROBLEMS IN UNDERGRADUATE STUDY: Donald E. Hargis, Mildred F. Berry, Roberta Buchanan, Arthur Eisenstadt, H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Alan W. Huckleberry, Robert A. Johnston, Wilbur Moore, William H. Perkins, Solomon Simonson, A. I. Thurman, Jr.

PROBLEMS IN GRADUATE STUDY: Horace Rahskopf, Clyde W. Dow, Claude Kantner, C. M. Wise.

PROBLEMS IN TEACHING SPEECH TO PREACHERS: Charles A. McGlon, Fr. Edward P. Atzert, John Bachman, Fred J. Barton, Paul Boase, Edmund Linn, Lowell G. McCoy, John J. Rudin, George William Smith, Abraham Tauber, Charles E. Weniger.

PROBLEMS IN TEACHING RADIO AND TELEVISION: D. Glenn Starlin, Thomas Battin, James G. Davis, W. C. Dempsey, Marguerite Fleming, Sydney Head, Ola Hiller, John Roberts, Forest L. Whan, E. William Ziebarth.

PROBLEMS IN MOTION PICTURES AND VISUAL AIDS: Karl F. Robinson, C. R. Carpenter, John Dietrich, Harold Nelson, David Potter.

PROBLEMS IN TEACHING SPEECH IN THE ARMED FORCES: George Batka, Paul R. Beall, C. David Cornell, Ralph E. Frybarger, Cyril F. Hager, Joseph Mahaffey, Eugene E. Myers.

PROBLEMS IN VOICE SCIENCE: Norman Freestone, T. D. Hanley, Dorothy Huntington, Eleanor Luse, Gordon Peterson, Clarence Simon, Charlotte G. Wells.

PROBLEMS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE: Orville L. Pence, Howard Gilkinson, Charles Lomas, Robert T. Oliver, Ross Scanlan.

PROBLEMS IN PHONETICS: Hilda Fisher, Malcolm C. Coxe, Gladys E. Lynch, C. K. Thomas, William R. Tiffany.

PROBLEMS IN INTERPRETATION: Garff B. Wilson, Eugene Bahn, Ray Irwin, Charlotte Lee, LaMont Okey, Melvin R. White.

PROBLEMS IN PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE: Joseph O'Brien, Wayne Brockriede, J. Calvin Callaghan, Lee Chapin, Carl Dallinger, James L. Golden, Charley A. Leistener, Yetta Mitchell, Lindsey Perkins.

PROBLEMS IN ADULT EDUCATION: Earnest Brandenburg, Thomas Dahle, Harold O. Haskett, George Hinds, James N. Holm, Franklin Knower, P. E. Lull, Ralph Nichols, Wesley Wiksell, Harold P. Zelko.

V. PROJECT COMMITTEES

VOLUME III OF THE HISTORY AND CRITICISM OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: Marie K. Hochmuth, W. Norwood Brigance, Donald C. Bryant.

VOLUME OF STUDIES OF PUBLIC ADDRESS ON THE ISSUE OF ANTISLAVERY AND DISUNION, *circa* 1860: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, H. L. Ewbank, Sr.

VOLUME OF STUDIES IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: George V. Bohman, Dallas C. Dickey, Ernest J. Wrage.

VOLUME OF STUDIES IN SOUTHERN ORATORY: Dallas C. Dickey, J. Jeffery Auer, Waldo W. Braden, Lindsey Perkins.

MICROFILMING OF RESOURCE MATERIALS IN THE FIELD OF SPEECH: Albert E. Johnson, Robert Dierlam, Frederick W. Haberman, Hubert C. Heffner, George R. Kernodle, William W. Melnitz, Richard Moody.

VI. AD HOC COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON AWARDS: Paul Bagwell, A. Craig Baird, Kenneth Clark, Rupert Cortright, Kenneth Hance, Barnard Hewitt, Sara Lowery.

COMMITTEE ON CODE OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS: Kenneth Hance, Paul Bagwell, Wilbur Gilman, Elbert Harrington, Claude Kantner, Lee Mitchell, Wanda Mitchell, Richard Murphy. (Additional member to be named from field of radio.)

COMMITTEE ON LIAISON WITH NCTE: Donald P. Veith, Malcolm Coxe, Kenneth Hance, Lee Hultzén, William Schab, Donald K. Smith, Charlotte Wells.

HONORARY MEMBERSHIP

The Executive Council of the Speech Association of America has established Honorary Membership for members who reach the age of retirement and who have been members of the Association for twenty years. Upon notification, the Executive Secretary will forward to

a member having these qualifications a Gold Card as a recognition of his able and loyal service to the profession and to the Association. Honorary Membership grants free admission to the National Convention.

The first Honorary Memberships were granted to A. Craig Baird and W. M. Parrish at the Convention in Chicago, December 28-30, 1954.

Departments should advise the Executive Secretary of members who are qualified to receive Honorary Memberships.

BUDGETS SUBMITTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AT 1954 CONVENTION

	Revised Budget 1954-55	Tentative Budget 1955-56
Publications:		
Quarterly Journal	$ 9,900	$ 9,900
Speech Monographs	3,000	3,500
Annual Directory	2,750	2,750
Special Printing	1,300	500
Repurchase of Old Copies	150	150
Speech Teacher	4,400	4,400
Printing and Mimeographing:		
Stationery	1,700	1,500
New Solicitations	1,000	1,500
Renewals	100	100
Placement	500	500
Convention	2,000	2,000
Personnel:		
Officers and Committees	1,700	1,500
Secretary and Clerical	14,500	14,500
Dues and Fees:		
American Council on Education	200	200
AETA Share of Convention Fee	—	500
Commissions and Discounts	1,400	1,400
Bank Charges	25	
Secretary's Bond and Audit	250	250
Other Expenses:		
Postage and Distribution	3,000	3,000
Binding	600	600
Telephone and Telegraph	250	250
Insurance	200	200
Office Equipment	500	500
Convention Expense	1,000	1,000
Reserve Fund	500	500
Contingency	500	500
Moving National Office	1,800	
Printing Abstracts and Distribution	500	
Office Supplies and Service	1,400	1,200
TOTALS	$55,125	$52,900

LINCOLN AS SPEAKER

One secret of Mr. Lincoln's remarkable success in captivating the popular mind is undoubtedly an unconsciousness of self which enables him, though under the necessity of constantly using the capital *I*, to do it without any suggestion of egotism. There is no single vowel which men's mouths can pronounce with such difference of effect. That which one shall hide away, as it were, behind the substance of his discourse, or, if he brings it to the front, shall use merely to give an agreeable accent of individuality to what he says, another shall make an offensive challenge to the self-satisfaction of all his hearers, and an unwarranted intrusion upon each man's sense of personal importance, irritating every pore of his vanity, like a dry northeast wind, to a goose-flesh of opposition and hostility. Mr. Lincoln has never studied Quinctilian; but he has, in the earnest simplicity and unaffected Americanism of his own character, one art of oratory worth all the rest. He forgets himself so entirely in his object as to give his *I* the sympathetic and persuasive effect of *We* with the great body of his countrymen. Homely, dispassionate, showing all the rough-edged process of his thought as it goes along, yet arriving at his conclusions with an honest kind of every-day logic, he is so eminently our representative man, that, when he speaks, it seems as if the people were listening to their own thinking aloud. The dignity of his thought owes nothing to any ceremonial garb of words, but to the manly movement that comes of settled purpose and an energy of reason that knows not what rhetoric means. . . . He has always addressed the intelligence of men, never their prejudice, their passion, or their ignorance.

James Russell Lowell, "Abraham Lincoln."

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

THOUGHTS ON THE HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN AMERICA

W. Cabell Greet

The Speech Association of America is to be congratulated upon the publication of its *History of Speech Education in America*. Everyone interested in the field owes a debt of gratitude to the Editor, the members of the Editorial Board, and the thirty-six contributors of the twenty-eight chapters. They range from "English Backgrounds of Rhetoric" to "National Speech Organization . . ." and ". . . Theatre Education," with about equal attention devoted to Cicero and his medieval followers, on the one hand, and to honor fraternities, on the other, with a bow to *Ad Herennium* and a Delsartian pose, with symbols for the deaf and phonemes for the phonetic. All the purlieus of speech, it seems to me, are represented, but I daresay that within the Association it has been discovered that some estimable borough, now vocal, was unheard. Alas, it must be so. And some names have been unmentioned. I did not find Lane Cooper, rhetorician and teacher of teachers of speech, though I claim that I share with the editors the distinction and edification of having read all of the text. Perhaps he is in a footnote that I nodded over.

This is a very good time to compile a history of speech education in America. The field has developed so rapidly that the present writers or their teachers knew the men and women most responsible for this remarkable growth, or if not them, at least their younger associates. Indeed, several of the writers are themselves pioneers in establishing order in these complicated realms. The achievement has been extraordinary, and to a considerable degree personal. Any delay would have obscured details of the fight that the leaders made—though delay might have created heroic legends of stalwarts like J. M. O'Neill, Winans, and Trueblood in public speaking. Similar romantic figures appear in theatrical education: Steele MacKaye, Sargent, David Belasco, Azubah Latham, and today Macgowan. The scientists have their superman appeal: from the Rushes and the Bells to Smiley Blanton and Harvey Fletcher.

Indeed it is a stimulating company, and whether one looks upon Delsartian charts or the dialect atlas, or dotes upon phrases like Organismic Approach or the Extempore Disputation, one must admire the insistence of these teachers, determined to order and direct, to analyze and improve, the speaking, hearing world. Salaams are their just due, especially from those who follow in their footsteps, like the reviewer and you, gentle reader, if you are here.

I hesitate to think about questioning

Mr. Greet (Ph.D., Columbia, 1926) is Professor of English and Head of the Department of English, Barnard College, Columbia University. Professor Greet has been editor of American Speech *since 1933.*

even details of their achievement! Like most revolutionaries and pioneers, they have questioned everything they pleased, past, present, and future, but I am not sure that they have been immune to the pedagogical sin of Pride. Perhaps the most refreshing passage in the book is on page 639 where Mr. Blanchard, writing on "Professional Theatre Schools in the Early Twentieth Century," says:

> . . . the schools are proud of their distinguished graduates; their officials and teachers believe, of course, that their training has been helpful. They seek professional placement for their pupils. To make any allegation about a possible cause-and-effect relationship between the training in the schools and later professional employment would require long and controlled study. . . . But . . . there seems to be little doubt that their graduates have made a definite impact on the American theatre. . . .

I cannot help but wish that on an earlier page another author had delicately put the hypothetical question, "Has speech education improved American speech?" Then we could answer in chorus, "To make any allegation about a possible cause-and-effect relationship between the training in the schools and general improvement . . . would require a controlled study, but there seems little doubt that there has been an impact."

I pray that some day a college generation will take into its pretty head the notion of speaking and writing well, just as the young people of fifteen years ago decided to have babies in greater numbers—without regard, here or in France, I believe, to the propaganda of societies for the encouragement of large families in the professional classes. How wonderful to be deluged in beautiful sounds and excellent style, as we are about to be in more students than we can handle.

We all know that the rhetoricians among us have a definite advantage. They can give an ancient and immediate "Yes" to the question of usefulness to lawyers and such. But somehow that is comparatively unimportant when one considers the humanistic glory of a subject like rhetoric. It helps "to keep intact as a unifying reference point for the undergraduate body, a common intellectual tradition, a sense of an intellectual community leading to a sense of continuity of human experiences." (The quoted words are from Senator Fulbright's speech on curriculum to the Association for Higher Education as reported in the *New York Times*, March 3, 1955.

Frankly I am suspicious of advance claimed in a sentence such as this in one of our chapters: "Indeed, it [speech] prospered in any school which recognized subjects 'in proportion to their relative importance for useful and successful living.'" In such a school, even "speech" the usurper may be forced from the curriculum by auto driving, diaper changing, and household tinkering, now that prices are high. In several chapters there are sentences which boast of the arrival of speech in college curriculums under circumstances which suggest that there it made little contribution to "an intellectual community." If this could be true, speech is not ennobled by inclusion in the college curriculum, the curriculum is just inflated. I cannot agree with a colleague that education for the many is education for none. It is quite obvious, however, that higher education in speech or in any other subject must "contribute to the sense of an intellectual community."

It may be amusing to say (page 451) that ". . . one of the practical reasons for tying composition to literature has been the humane necessity of providing an avenue of hope for teachers of composition." The patent fact is that distinguished teachers of speech as well as of

composition have defected to literature. However, isn't there reason to be proud when teachers and students ask for more than technique? I do not believe that it is feasible on an adult level to study and teach technique divorced from "subject-matter" embraced in our intellectual tradition and its community. There are no exceptions. We hear notable scientists say strange things in confusion when their laboratory results have outstripped their humane philosophies and religion. There can be no exceptions—not even when teachers of subject matter have starved teachers of technique into rebellion and separation; not even when teachers of literature have taken the chairs of earlier teachers of rhetoric, and perhaps in arrogance profit daily, hourly, from the labors of eighteenth-century actor-lexicographers.

Conversely teachers of literature must know something of the *practice* of literature or they become desiccated and deformed antiquarians, valuable only for odd bits of learning if at all. Intellectual history is crowded with minds that lost touch with the practice that their learning should illuminate. It is noteworthy that the church fathers were practical men, so were Shakespeare and Napoleon and Goethe. The parable is the philosopher's favorite tool, and precedent, the judge's. The college problem is to combine technique and subject matter.

We must ask then, What is the subject matter of speech, the intellectual continuum? This question is the crux of so much of importance to the profession that I am hardly entitled to an opinion. I am sorry to say that only once in reading this book did I get a sense of professional unity. That was in the chapter "Some Teachers and the Transition to Twentieth-Century Speech Education," by Giles Wilkeson Gray, himself one of the leaders.

The answer that speech is a service subject, though a fact, is no answer at all. Equally true but more disturbing is the reply that "the teacher of speech moves in many orbits." If he moves as a medical man in many orbits, he is sustained (and restrained) in his own orbit by an ancient and active discipline and a philosophy though unsystematic. If the speech teacher moves in many orbits the creature of none—why this is a definition of a lost soul.

Teachers of public speaking are sustained by the study of rhetoric and its history. (The chapters on rhetoric are, I believe, the most convincing and the best written in this book.) The speech correctionists look to the life sciences, or like phoneticians and linguists to a newly-staked area of speech science. The teachers of theatre can be refreshed by Shakespeare and the great dramatists. The speech interpreters can study literature. But these are or can be different subjects. This is the reason, of course, why so many speech teachers rely upon a loose education theory as the unifying principle or philosophy or intellectual binder. The title of this book, *History of Speech Education in America,* asks a double judgment. As a history of energetic men in an expanding college and school world, it is interesting, worth writing, and worth reading. But it throws little light, it seems to me, upon educational substance which must underlie a unified subject of importance and stature. The founding fathers have left this job to their followers. The problem of a speech-curriculum of satisfying intellectual content, remains. The great leaders were trained in other, older disciplines. They have therefore the advantage of some of their followers.

The dilemma of teachers of speech is not very different from that of teachers of college English. Should these rely

upon the tradition of grammarians or literary critics, historians of ideas or popular story-tellers, compositors of printing houses or record keepers, aesthetes or compilers of quiddities? We may well ask why transcendentalism seems to us glorious in Emerson, provocative in Thoreau, artistic in Hawthorne, but curious in Alcott, pathetic in the boarders at Brook Farm, and almost absurd in some of the so-called elocutionists. It is stranger still that Victorian radicals stimulated transcendental faith in "the oversoul," and in the same breath, faith in science and scientific method. The chapters on elocution in the nineteenth century give remarkable examples of the Kantian spirit of the century on the road, so to speak, of the itinerant teachers, who remind me of the Canterbury Pilgrims.

If we may be transcendental ourselves, we will observe that their interest in speech was the result of forces that have continued to show themselves in the perfection and systematic use of telephone, radio, television, and all the arts and sciences of communication. We may say that every advance in culture has followed upon an advance in communication. We are entering upon a period of "one world." If we believe and try to make it so, perhaps the tubular connection to the Oversoul is the coaxial cable. Until this is established, I recommend three years of Greek.

It seems to me that the writers of the chapter on phonetics were somewhat embarrassed by uncertainty of the meanings of the word and by the terminal date which was recommended for the book as a whole (1925). Their account of orthoepy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is interesting and useful. I wish that they had included more illustrative material, such as the Deseret alphabet and a photograph of Benjamin Franklin's transcriptions. (C. M. Wise's monograph is out of print.) I should be willing to trade the space now given to lists of those who followed Kenyon's use of symbols and those who preferred Tilley's. (Isn't there a misprinting for the last character in line 21, page 331?) The nature of the syllable still confuses me, likewise juncture as a criterion of dialect. It is good to have available the story of the conflict of the NEA Phonetic Alphabet and the Webster key. The progressives did not win all the battles they undertook; some continue. Spelling is of such importance to speech that many world-characters among missionaries, commentators, airplane personnel, politicians, and generals would be willing to give up hope for a one-world language, in exchange for an up-to-date one-world alphabet. Such is the use of symbols that one alphabet would mean, in a sense, one language.

Historical phoneticians will be grateful for the inclusion, in Chapter Thirteen, of a Boston admonition of 1821 for the primary grades: "[Learn] . . . the catalogue of vulgarisms, such as chimney, not chimbley—vinegar, not winegar." The confusion is still preserved, as Professor Ayres pointed out, in Bermuda and other West Indian isles, with "viskey" for whiskey as well as "wery" for very.

Debate probably has its roots in a folk art as ancient as the family and village. We can see it continue among students even when the faculty and the student body are indifferent. I know a college where four debaters can hold forth in a hall empty except for a dozen others waiting their turn, a judge or two, and some seconds. With no visible audience, their faces shine, their eyes snap, they finger their cards and gesture. While waiting their turn they move nervously like athletes. It is good to give them an

audience, and to have had a brass band and a parade must have been wonderful!

One must admire the organization of Chapter Twenty-Three, "Educational Dramatics in Nineteenth-Century Colleges." It is ungrateful to ask the witty author where, except in a calendar, does "a sharp line" divide the eighteenth from the nineteenth century. As I remember, Virginia Woolf in *Orlando* said that in the last years of the eighteenth, there were many days of rain, a period of wet weather from which the British climate (and temper) never recovered. Consonart with Mrs. Woolf's *Room of One's Own* are his notes:

> College girls acting the male roles . . . were forbidden to wear men's clothes. Goucher College "men" wore gymnasium costumes, long ulsters, or raincoats over their skirts. At Mount Holyoke "prior to (1918) . . . bloomers, instead of trousers . . . lent a hilarious touch to many a scene," while dark skirts were the convention which indicated masculinity in Vassar plays.

Ah sweet days of innocence or of consciousness of sin? Anyway they seem happy days when B stood for Mrs. Bloomer and not for bomb.

There is good stuff in these chapters on drama—cheerful news about the square of the hypotenuse—for instance (page 565):

> Sargent often argued that stage managers were the best teachers of acting. . . . Actors made very poor teachers, Sargent insisted, because they could not easily devote themselves exclusively to the needs of the student. Teaching required great humility and was a special art in its own right.

(John Kouwenhoven has observed that editors are generally better teachers of composition than are writers.) And on page 637:

> The old actor practiced more and rehearsed less than his modern counterpart. At present, the actor is likely to practice little, and rehearse to the point of exhaustion. But from the standpoint of the actor-artist and his teachers, good ensemble is not enough. The individual actor still needs training.

In the last chapter of the book is appropriately a final word on self-determination of small peoples:

> Just as theatre training left the English departments along with speech training, so teachers of theatre became members of the National Association of Teachers of Speech when it organized in 1914 as a splinter group of the English association. However since neither of these organizations evidenced more than perfunctory interest in the teaching of theatre, they served only as transitional agencies . . . to the [theatre] associations subsequently organized.

Shades of the Modern Language Association and German philology! How picayune must we get? Perhaps the answer is that when every prof. over thirty-five is his own department, departments and departmental lines will be abolished. Or perhaps all will be absorbed in a department of communication—NATO or UN—and we can again start to splinter when the administrators are not looking.

There is no doubt, of course, that the dividing and subdividing has made higher titles and higher salaries, more courses and more jobs. Has it, however, weakened our sense of being members of one intellectual community with a common intellectual tradition and a confidence in the continuity of human experience? In short, has it sapped our feeling of intellectual security? I think it has. Too often we distract ourselves and mislead our students by searching for old separate foundations for our new specialties, or we are content to build on sand. We rehearse present problems to the point of exhaustion, having practiced little or not at all to unite in ourselves the ancient indivisible liberal arts.

A glory of the Speech Association is that it holds many "splinter groups" together, as witnessed in this volume. May they be fused into one tradition, for the sake of our country and the intellectual community of democracy, *e pluribus unum*.

BOOK REVIEWED

History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies. Edited by Karl R. Wallace, with an Editorial Board consisting of Warren Guthrie, Frederick W. Haberman, Harold Westlake, Barnard Hewitt and Claude M. Wise. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Inc., 1954; pp. x+687. $7.50.

12 AMERICANS SPEAK. Facsimiles of Original Editions selected and annotated by John E. Pomfret. San Marino, Calif: Huntington Library, 1954; pp. vi+183. $5.00.

A dozen and three American political classics by an even dozen American speakers are printed in this volume and are given here in the form which they had in the eyes of their earliest readers.

Benjamin Franklin is represented by the first twelve pages of *The Examination* as those pages looked in the fifty-page pamphlet in which they appeared at London in 1766. This pamphlet consisted of Franklin's dialogue with a questioner before the House of Commons on the subject of the Stamp Act of March, 1765; and (in Dr. Pomfret"s words) it shows Franklin at a moment when "with consummate skill he argued against the imposition of direct taxes by Parliament."

Thomas Paine is represented by *The American Crisis No. 1* as that document looked in 1776 in one of its earliest appearances as a pamphlet. All of us know the famous opening words of Paine's call to arms—"These are the times that try men's souls." All of us may now know them as they looked in the eighteenth-century print of Melchior Steiner and Charles Cist of Philadelphia.

A facsimile of the first separate printing of his Farewell Address of 1796 stands for Washington in this volume. The Farewell Address was never delivered as a speech but reached the public originally through the columns of the *Daily Advertiser* of New York on September 17, 1796. Later that year it was given separate printings, the first of which is reproduced here.

Thomas Jefferson's great First Inaugural Address is given in a facsimile of an early Boston edition. James Madison's War Message is reproduced in the format originally imposed upon it in 1812 by Roger C. Weightmen of Washington. Three paragraphs buried in two separate places of James Monroe's Seventh Annual Message to Congress are printed here as Gales and Seaton under the title, "The Monroe Doctrine," printed them in 1823. Lincoln's two inaugurals and the Gettysburg Address, Bryan's Cross of Gold Speech, excerpts from two of Theodore Roosevelt's Messages to Congress, and Woodrow Wilson's speech urging the Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, follow along in facsimiles of their first or a very early edition. Herbert Hoover (Dr. Pomfret declares that Hoover "never used a ghost writer") is represented by a facsimile of the first pamphlet issue of his speech on October 22, 1928, in New York, when he was campaigning for the Presidency in a seemingly unshakable world of rugged individuals. And FDR, last of Dr. Pomfret's twelve, is represented by a facsimile of the first printing of his address before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco, September 23, 1932, when he was still known only as Governor of New York, and when the world of rugged individuals still seemed to Republican hopefuls to be capable of surviving through the November elections of that year.

These fifteen documents as presented and annotated in this well-made volume are to be strongly recommended to all students of American speaking. For the most part, we now can never know how these twelve Americans sounded to the hearers of their own times; but when we read their words in the print of their times, we can come close to imagining how their voices might have sounded to those who heard them first. Thus does Dr. Pomfret's book serve to re-create the context in which these twelve Americans originally spoke.

WILBUR SAMUEL HOWELL,
Princeton University

AMERICAN DEMAGOGUES: TWENTIETH CENTURY. By Reinhard H. Luthin. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1954; pp. xv+368. $5.00.

This volume, according to its author, is the first book-length account of the demagogue in America. It is strange that this should be so, for the demagogue has been with us from our beginnings, and demagoguery is a subject which has long attracted the attention of historians and critics of democratic government. Reinhard Luthin here traces the public careers of ten demagogues of the present century—Curley, Bilbo, Thompson, Murray, Hague, the Fergusons, Talmadge, Marcantonio, Long, and McCarthy. Each man is presented in a biographical-critical essay of approximately thirty pages. Although the list is admittedly selective, one wonders at the omission of Father Charles E. Coughlin. The author notes the significant fact that with but two exceptions all the demagogues he discusses were state rather than national figures, and that this

with the *Princeps*. The author accounts for the lack of opposition by the rhetoricians in this statement: "The rhetoricians, after all, had a tradition of accommodation to political life as it actually existed at any point of time."

However, the historical data contained in the book is commonplace, and the attention paid to intellectual movements seldom leads to new or profound conclusions. The treatment is extensive rather than intensive, since the author concentrates on a few key figures and generalizes extensively about the remainder of the more than 400 years covered by the book.

There seems little for the student of oratory in this book that he could not get directly or by inference from his regular readings in Cicero, Quintilian, Seneca the Elder, Tacitus, Eunapius, and Saint Augustine. With the possible exceptions of a brief chapter on Cicero and these sections on repressive measures, it is perhaps even too drawn-out to suggest for corollary reading.

JAMES J. MURPHY,
Stanford University

THE SOUTH IN AMERICAN LITERATURE: 1607-1900. By Jay B. Hubbell. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1954; pp. xx+988. $10.00.

Projected for almost twenty years, long awaited, long needed, *The South in American Literature: 1607-1900* is a massive contribution to literary history by the founding editor of *American Literature*, emeritus Professor Hubbell, of Duke University. The vacuum partly filled by this volume was enormous—surprisingly so, one might think, in view of the many excellent studies of the social and political history of the South. Earlier "comprehensive" studies of Southern literature—the last appeared in 1910—are, by comparison, so brief, so factually unreliable, and (often) so partisan that Mr. Hubbell's work may almost be thought of as standing alone or, as a writer in the ante-bellum South might have said, *sui generis*.

Too long and detailed to capture a reader not specially interested, this is a conveniently encyclopedic work to which one may turn in beginning to answer ordinary questions about nearly any phase of Southern literature prior to 1900. Its particular merit is in adding greatly to our stock of easily available information on minor writers. Mr. Hubbell has been prolific of biographical data and has fortified his descriptive and critical comments by frequent quotations from the authors discussed. A full index points out passages on such topics as literary taste, magazines, the status of authors, education, conditions in printing and publishing, and North-South literary relations; and the book includes a valuable annotated bibliography, a selective list that runs to nearly one hundred pages.

Such an amassing of useful information deserves high praise. Although vastly more information about Southern literature is now to be had than the shards and rubbish at hand twenty years ago, the materials presented here are in considerable part the product of the author's own laborious researches in such sources as periodicals, newspapers, and manuscript collections.

After emphasizing the usefulness of the book, one must add that it may not be judged equally satisfactory in all respects: it is deficient in balance and in critical acuteness. The principles governing inclusion or exclusion of ancillary matter are difficult to discover; examination of the Table of Contents reveals an odd asymmetry. At one time Mr. Hubbell intended to stop his history at the close of the Civil War and the book would have profited by his doing so, for the one hundred and fifty pages given to the period from 1865 to 1900 are decidedly sketchy. Literary critics can take exception to many of the judgments expressed; they may particularly regret that in discussing such well-known writers as Poe, Twain, Lanier, Cable, and Glasgow, Mr. Hubbell has not utilized sharper and currently more acceptable critical tools. Historians may consider the condensed essays on historical background lacking in substance and shading; and students of rhetoric will search in vain for extended observations on Southern oratory.

Perhaps the ultimate question for the reader of any literary history has to do with the esthetic values of the works surveyed. That the South had a literature worthy of critical attention before Faulkner, Williams, Tate, Warren, and Capote has in a sense been tacitly denied—at least a body of criticism has not developed. Mr. Hubbell is modest in his claims, but he thinks he has demonstrated that there was more and better writing in the Old South than has been generally supposed. Acceptance of this proposition depends, to be sure, on what *has* been generally supposed; but in the face of Mr. Hubbell's heuristic, the regrettable truth is that the Old South and the Reconstruction South were not strong in belles-lettres. When a few notable names are subtracted, there

remains a respectable group of cultivated gentlemen more interesting to the cultural historian than to the critic.

GUY A. CARDWELL,
The Huntington Library

THE THEATRE IN OUR TIMES: A SURVEY OF THE MEN, MATERIALS AND MOVEMENTS IN THE MODERN THEATRE. By John Gassner. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1954; pp. xiv+609. $5.00.

Bringing together a number of the essays he has written during the past few years, John Gassner states that his purpose has been to "make some sense out of the contemporary theatre." A sensible and informed critic, he is equal to this hazardous assignment.

Gassner groups his materials under four major headings: "Perspectives of Theatre"; "The Signature of the Times"; "The Incubi of Our Stage"; and "Film Perspectives." Within these frames he offers more than eighty separate though interrelated historical, critical and theoretical discussions of modern drama and theatre.

Readers of his *Masters of the Drama* and the critical prefaces in his anthologies will again find here evidence of Gassner's skill in the close analysis of playscripts. He brings his talents to bear on plays by Barry, Becque, Eliot, Fry, Odets and Yeats, among a great many others. Diverse as are the plays, trends, and philosophies he has chosen to consider, a strong critical conviction unifies the treatments.

More than a survey of plays and playwrights, the book serves to reiterate its author's belief that altogether too many "experiments" in modern drama and theatre have been irresponsible. Standing firm on the side of the humanistic-realistic tradition, Gassner reminds us, "Drama is drama to the degree to which it constitutes cohesive, meaningful action involving human characters, regardless of what other gratifications may be provided by the play and the stage production."

Although he disclaims that he has been thorough, Gassner not only ranges with obvious familiarity among an impressive number of plays, but his on-the-aisle experience enables him to report directly on actual performances as well. He selects astutely, training his critical sights on definitive plays and productions, and wasting no time on trash and imitations. Shaw rates (and Gassner makes us feel he deserves) six essays, each a discerning tribute to his greatness. The theatre is soundly rebuked for its shameful neglect of O'Neill, its banishment of O'Casey and its misunderstanding of Ibsen. Gassner explains Brecht and reconsiders his original verdicts on Williams and Miller. These discussions particularly generate both heat and light.

Of particular value is Gassner's persuasive argument on behalf of "organic reality" in drama. It is high time, he insists, for the playwright to set out to capture "the reality of both universal and contemporary man." The two need not be incompatible. Actor and dramatists must re-establish their dependence on one another; and both must sever the cord that has bound them to the mechanical marvels of theatricalism, while diverting them from their true obligations and potentialities.

The Theatre in Our Times should not be read straight through from cover to cover, for so read the book betrays structural defects one might anticipate when miscellaneous essays from various journals and periodicals are squeezed together within the confines of a single volume. Pet phrases have a disconcerting way of popping up again and again, each time as though never used before. There are critics with more agile styles than Gassner's. His sentences are sometimes ponderous, e.g., "The ersatz-mystique, suspect alike to social and religious realists, can be charged against a fetishist overemphasis of 'spiritual awakening' and other towering flights romantically predicated for tragedy." His comic sense is heavy, if the satirical summary of Cocteau's "The Infernal Machine" may be taken as a sample.

But these flaws hardly disqualify a book which any student or teacher of modern drama and theatre will want to have within easy reach, to consult about the course of drama during the past half-century. Playwrights too might well take to heart Gassner's warnings and exhortations. In Gassner we have a critic who, like Shaw in his *The Saturday Review* days, may not care for much of what he has seen on the stage, but who, again like Shaw, does greatly care about what the drama may become "in our times." With equal honesty he declares himself on what has been and what may be.

JONATHAN CURVIN,
University of Wisconsin

LIFE AND THE THEATRE. By Lynton A. Hudson. New York: Roy Publishers, 1954; pp. 191. $3.00.

Lynton Hudson is a pleasant and trustworthy guide as he considers a period of drama between the two wars in the light of Ludwig Lewisohn's words: "Literature is . . . an end-

less, ever-changing scripture and revelation . . . of the life of man."

Few facets in the life of man and theatre are neglected in this little book for which the author has selected playwrights because of their "extension of the range of dramatic material" or for personal reasons—because the author has seen their plays produced and found them intellectually and emotionally enjoyable rather than merely entertaining. Mr. Hudson ranges easily between playwrights, plays, and commonplaces—between Toler, O'Casey, and Kaufman; *Goat Song, Mystery Boufee, Life with Father,* and *Oklahoma;* Wall Street, sex appeal, "Falling in Love Again," and animated cartoons ("*Hoppity comes to Town* achieved delightfully what the Capeks ingeniously attempted"). A few of the author's phrases will represent his pleasantly serious treatment:

". . . the theatre has been most vital when it has given expression to the eagerness of" an "ever-changing quest." It has reflected a "revolution in human thought." "Chekhov seems to be the first to ask the modern question: 'which is waking and which sleeping—the opium trance of our illusions or the active bustle of everyday affairs?'" That question raised implicitly by Chekhov, was "then stated boldly by Pirandello in a new 'drama of ideas'" which "made his public think passionately."

". . . truly amazing is the schizophrenia of the German post-1918 drama: the visionary mysticism alongside the direct encouragement of brutality and sensuality in every form." This chapter on "Chaos in Life and Drama" gives special attention to Wedekind and to the German expressionists. In France "The Theatre of Introspection" was nurtured in side-street theatres and moved by way of a group of "young iconoclasts" to "a lengthy list of those who have serious claims to be considered dramatists." The accent there is upon Lenormand (although many playwrights are expertly fitted into a few pages), and upon introspection as "a modern disease."

"The Drama in Uniform" is Soviet regulated (Chekhov's post-dated comment: "the whole idea of a People's Theatre and a People's Literature is foolishness and lollipops for the people"). Chapter Seven, "Symbolic Evangelism and the Philosophical Revue," describes "Werfel's ecstatic flame," and points to the "significantly modern" idea "of the positive and relentless power of Evil." In contrast is the *Gemütlichkeit* of Vienna and Budapest—"the habit of not being solemn when one is serious, and the ability to see the fun in an idea." Ferenc Molnar, "the outstanding figure of the Central European theatre," is the only writer of comedies extensively treated by Hudson.

Scandinavian "Theatre Militant," as represented by Nordahl Grieg and others, presents "a violence not only of the playwright's attitude to life ('Goodness can only triumph by violence'), but also a . . . truculent flaunting of the rules of dramatic craftsmanship." "The Return to Greek Tragedy," Chapter Ten, calls for a treatment of Hasenclever, Anhouilh, O'Neill ("to whom we seem to be constantly returning"), Sartre (his "new *genre* of Fate-drama"), and others.

". . . whereas the mental climate of Europe has been in the main a curve of deepening pessimism, for America it was a period of expansion and buoyancy." "Almost alone of American dramatists Eugene O'Neill seems to have the poetic gift. In himself he resumes all the intellectual and technical experimentation of the European theatre." But from Clayton Hamilton's comment on a 1919 production of Gorky's *Night Lodging*—"not one person in the seventeen . . . worthy of respect," America's "Theatre in Prosperity" moved through academically inspired advances "in the subsidiary dramatic arts," through "one really original achievement: the modern evolution of the 'musical,'" to a production in 1946 of O'Neill's *The Iceman Cometh*—"seventeen people . . . succinctly classified as 'bums.'" "There is implicit the lesson the nations of Europe have had to learn the hard way: that you cannot have peace unless you are prepared to fight for it. And the lesson America is now learning: that you cannot have the way of life you want unless you are prepared to pay for it." The reader may bring these comments up-to-date.

Mr. Hudson closes his tightly-packed little book with a chapter on the drama of his own country. The chapter title is: "A Dose of Paregoric." He concludes: "The coming dramatist will be wise to seek the secret of the drama, not in abstractions and metaphysics and contempt for the banal, but in vividly grasping the particular, in watching an audience in the theatre enjoying a vicarious experience of life."

RUSSELL W. LEMBKE,
Chicago, Illinois

GEORGE PIERCE BAKER AND THE AMERICAN THEATRE. By Wisner Payne Kinne. Cambridge, Massaschusetts: The Harvard University Press, 1954; pp. xiv+355. $6.00.

The life of George Pierce Baker, the founder

and guiding spirit of the Harvard "47 Workshop" in playwriting, was a drama of paradoxes. It was also full of irony. The paradoxes may be explained away by the character of the man himself, his versatility and resourcefulness. But the irony was apparent as much in dilemmas into which he got himself as it was in the unpremeditated situations which were characteristic of his whole life.

G. P., as he was popularly known, was not the first teacher of drama in this country, but he was the first teacher to relate his teaching to the practical arts of an institution outside the university. Through some fifteen years of rather intimate acquaintance, and through innumerable talks and letters, I had never heard him suggest that the theatre ought to invade the campus. What he felt should grow in the university was an experimental theatre that might feed plays and playwrights into the professional theatre. He saw the production of established plays in the university as an educational asset, enabling his playwrights to have a chance to see technically good and historically interesting dramas. If Harvard would have allowed him this kind of theatre in 1918, he would never have left. During the summer of 1918 and through 1919 he spent many happy days discussing the blueprints of what he hoped would be the Harvard Theatre. That it never came to realization was for many of us the bitterest irony of G. P.'s life.

Ironic, too, is the fact that of his books, *The Principles of Argumentation* made him known and brought fame to him long before and long after his reputation for the Workshop was established; while his *Dramatic Technique*, which he wanted to be his *magnum opus*, worried him in the writing and never seemed to be satisfactory.

And how ironic, finally, that the Yale Theatre should be considered a monument to him! In his remarkably skillful reconstruction of much of Baker's life, Professor Kinne seems to me to be absolutely wrong when he says, regarding the theatre at Yale, that Baker could not have had a "more personal and satisfying monument." The Yale Theatre was impersonal as far as G. P. was concerned. Its elaborate technical equipment mystified him. I do not think I am wrong when I suggest that deep down inside of him, G. P. never felt it was *his* theatre. His monument he left at Harvard even though it cannot be seen there today. It is the monument of any great teacher—the lasting, magnificent effect on the lives of several generations of Harvard men and on a few in particular for whom he was the greatest single influence.

In his preface to Professor Kinne's book, John Mason Brown says that every Bakerite will have many more stories to tell, many more incidents to relate. The present biography is particularly good in its meticulous account of the early years of Baker's career at Harvard, the reconstruction of so much that needs to be remembered in the attempts at a repertory theatre. Baker's relationship to the American theatre has been excellently recorded.

There are obvious holes in the account. The book would have been richer if it had described a typical Workshop procedure, if it had given some first-hand description of Baker's directing technique as we saw it in the rehearsals in Lower Massachusetts Hall, of the conferences with playwrights in which G. P. was extremely skillful in reading a manuscript so that its faults seemed to stand out, of the reading of plays which he enjoyed so much. I remember an evening with Hubert Osborne at Boulder Farm, a place where G. P. spent so much time and energy trying to grow roses and potatoes in the most obstinate ground New England ever produced. Osborne had brought a draft of *Shore Leave* to show to Baker. G. P. read the play to us and in the reading seemed to sense rightness and wrongness in the plot as well as in the dialogue. It was as if he had a second sense which more often than not never found expression in words. But no one could not have responded to his delight over the revised first act or to the characteristic sparkle in his eyes when the next morning Osborne had a telegram from David Belasco saying that he wanted the play, having read the first act.

A more minute description of the whole Workshop process would have been valuable for the record. The discussion of the audience criticisms and all they meant was one of the notable things about the Harvard experience. A leaflet printed in 1919 called, *The 47 Workshop* gives a complete description of the process, including instructions to the critic-audience as to their part in the performance. It was a unique process.

Professor Kinne suggests that there were rumors that other universities offered Professor Baker a chance to teach when the doors seemed to be closing on a Harvard Theatre. These were more than rumors. Northwestern University's School of Speech offered him a job in 1922. He came to Evanston, spent two days there, surveyed the situation which meant the starting of a full-fledged department of drama on the foundation of a speech school that

had attained national reputation. In a letter written on April 1, 1922, he says: "I have written (Dean) Dennis declining his invitation. I thought the matter over carefully all the way home and I have been thinking of it almost constantly ever since my return. Finally I wrote him day before yesterday definitely declining his invitation. The reasons most important to my mind are the absence of any large group of graduate students and my question as to my personal fitness to deal with a town and gown theatre, used as I have been to having an absolutely free hand in running the Workshop." Interestingly enough, G. P. recommended Alexander Dean who came to Northwestern the next year and so distinguished himself that Baker took him to Yale when the theatre was started there.

Nor does Professor Kinne give much of a picture of G. P.'s close friends, the relationships to which he gave a substantial portion of his time. Percival Reniers, for instance, was much more than a secretary. Kenneth Raisbeck was more than "astonishing." He was less instrumental in working on the *Dramatic Technique*, except in the mechanical details of the printing, than he was in playing a major role in the writing of the Plymouth Pageant. His help both in England and after the return to this country was important. Nor is there any indication of the closeness of Herman Hagadorn. In another letter he wrote: "I'm glad you like Hagadorn's work. He is one of the finest men I know or have known, and I want people . . . to like his work at least as much as I do." This, for G. P., was saying a lot.

No mention is made of the enormous energy G. P. gave to the writing of the movie series, *The Chronicles of America*. Some of us felt that this adventure had a draining effect on him and affected his work in the theatre. He had a feeling that he ought to be interested in motion pictures and that there was a great future in their use educationally.

His interest in William Vaughn Moody made it particularly fitting that he should have been chosen to give the Moody Lectures at the University of Chicago in May, 1933. He was no longer able to stand as he spoke, and occasionally during the lectures he had to steady himself even as he sat. But he was still able to give the audience a sense of the development of the theatre in America. I do not know what happened to the manuscript of these lectures. He was still able to meet the old Workshop people in the Chicago area and to talk to them as intimately as if they were still in the shop and had a play ready for discussion. It was also his last report to his loyal students—he seemed to sense that he would never get "West" again.

But to point out these and many other omissions is not to be unappreciative of the job that Professor Kinne has done. To catch the essential charm of the man, to understand his extraordinary influence in the university as in the professional theatre, to analyze his methods and ideas—all this is a difficult and elusive task. That Professor Kinne has succeeded in many respects is cause for rejoicing. To those who never knew Professor Baker and who may have heard his name, here is a book about him to be read. To those who did know him and worked with him and felt very close to him, here is a book which tries the impossible and almost succeeds.

HAROLD EHRENSPERGER,
Boston University

KING HENRY V. Edited by J. H. Walter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954: pp. xlviii+167. $3.25.

ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA. Edited by M. R. Ridley. (Ninth edition, revised and reset). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954: pp. lvi+285. $3.85.

Both of these volumes belong to the series of revised Arden editions of Shakespeare, now appearing under the general editorship of Una Ellis-Fermor. H. A. Evans's original Arden edition of *Henry V* appeared in 1903 and was twice reprinted. For the new series J. H. Walter has entirely rewritten footnotes and introduction and provided three new appendices (extracts from Holinshed, a note on the gift of the tennis balls and the wooing scene from *The Famous Victories of Henry the Fift*.) The notes (a few of them retained from the first Arden) are very thorough, and make use of much scholarship that has appeared in the half-century since Evans's edition. The introduction, not nearly so provocative or so well written as Kenneth Muir's for the new Arden *Macbeth* (see my review in *QJS* last April), is largely devoted to special pleading, largely directed to those like myself who find the play on the whole rather offensively jingoistic (one remembers G.I.s' reports that the French found Sir Laurence Olivier's movie version hilariously amusing in what seemed to them its cavalier unconcern with historical authenticity) and its hero in the main a wooden and unrealized figure. Acknowledging great diversity in critical

opinions of the play, Walter defends Shakespeare by basing his interpretation upon a belief that the playwright was trying to dramatize an epic theme, combining medieval and renaissance theories of the ideal Christian king. Walter argues that in *I Henry IV* Hal attains physical perfection, in *II Henry IV* intellectual perfection, and that in this third play, as king, he has gone through a genuine religious conversion and reached spiritual perfection, thus becoming the "mirror of Christendom." The argument is cleverly presented and possibly justified, although I confess I still find it difficult to accept Shakespeare's possession of the great burden of wide scholarship modern criticism would assign to him. More convincing is Walter's claim that Shakespeare's debt is greater to Hall's *Union of the Two Noble Houses* than to the previously accepted chief source, Holinshed's *Chronicles*. And more interesting is the theory (originally propounded in *MLR*, July 1946) that originally, as promised at the close of *II Henry IV*, Falstaff accompanied Henry's forces to France; this theory at least explains certain inconsistencies in the First Folio text, which is here followed almost completely.

In contradistinction to Walter's revision of *Henry V*, M. R. Ridley has based his of *Antony and Cleopatra* upon the 1906 Arden edition by R. H. Case, even to retaining almost intact Case's original introduction, and contenting himself with a sixteen-page preface and twelve pages of additional introductory comment. This comment is substantially the material Ridley prepared for his edition of the play in the New Temple Shakespeare (1935) slightly expanded and considerably improved stylistically. Indeed, in style, in sensitivity, and in imaginative realization, it forms one of the finest appreciations of *Antony and Cleopatra*; and short as it is, deserves ranking with A. C. Bradley's lecture in his *Oxford Lectures on Poetry* (1909) or Norman Pearson's lecture at the Yale Shakespeare Festival in 1953. I am in hearty sympathy with Ridley's conclusion that "we have here beyond question Shakespeare's topmost achievement in dramatic poetry, that kind of poetry which apart from context is little remarkable but in its dramatic setting is indefinably moving." The text is mainly that prepared by Case for the original Arden edition except that it returns frequently to the Folio reading "against a commonly accepted emendation." Ridley has "considerably lightened" the critical apparatus since he is aiming mainly at the novice-student and the ordinary reader. Most of Case's original notes have been retained, although the editor has "without comment" added an occasional gloss for the modern reader or "cut out one of Case's more recondite illustrations." More importantly Ridley has added (by my count) 108 original glosses and thirty-eight additions "whether by way of amplification or doubt," to Cases's. These are almost uniformly brilliantly suggestive and persuasive, and illustrate beautifully Ridley's unusual ability constantly to visualize a production on Shakespeare's stage, rather than to indulge in wool-gathering pedantic closet-quibbling. These contributions of the present editor are readily found by the alert and curious reader, since each is prefixed by a dagger and followed by a bracketed R. The appendices are five in number: Ridley has incorporated most of Case's Appendix One in "the notes on the passages concerned," but has "left standing the long note on the arm-gaunt steed." Ridley's typical concern with his text as theatre-in-performance rather than as a scholarly puzzle is illustrated by his single (parenthetical) comment on this retention: "But challenge any actor to deliver this line as thus emended." He has omitted Case's second appendix and added three new appendices, one on the mislineation of the Folio, and one on the punctuation of the Folio as preferable to suggested emendations and a really brilliant one on the staging of scenes IV, xv and V, ii. The fifth appendix retains Case's extracts from North's *Plutarch* on the character of Antony.

It is with distinct pleasure that I recommend this particular volume of the new Arden series without reservation to student, scholar, general reader, and even more particularly to the active practitioner in theatre. More Shakespearean editors like M. R. Ridley, acutely alive to the demands of practical theatre, might eventually successfully defend the world's master-dramatist against the veiled attacks of the school of over-erudite, occult, over-clever, *clique*-ish, confused and confusing, erotic and esoteric "modern" critics. A consummation definitely to be wished.

E. J. West,
University of Colorado

THE THEATRICAL PUBLIC IN THE TIME OF GARRICK. By Harry William Pedicord. New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University, 1954; pp. xi+267. $3.75.

THE CRITICS IN THE AUDIENCE OF THE LONDON THEATRES FROM BUCKINGHAM TO SHERIDAN: A STUDY OF NEO-

CLASSICISM IN THE PLAYHOUSE, 1671-1779. By Dane Farnsworth Smith. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1953; pp. 192. $1.50.

The two publications under consideration probe, in general, the same subject and the same period, but with different scalpels. Pedicord examines such heretofore unanswered problems as the size of audiences at the two Patent houses, "the economic aspects of eighteenth century playgoing, the quality of the spectators and that of the repertoire as measured in terms of popularity at the box office," whereas Smith substantiates the apparent truth that "the poetical theories of the Renaissance and the rules of French classicism had a marked effect on the theatre-going public in London and gave rise to a pattern of social behavior which played a significant part in shaping the dramatic productions of the age."

Both of these specialized studies are admirable contributions to the history of the theatre and both made fascinating reading for this reviewer. Along with James L. Lynch's *Box, Pit, and Gallery; Stage and Society in Johnson's London,* they are important additions to the earlier work of Odell, Nicoll, Thaler, and Kelly.

A glance at Pedicord's bibliography, his "Notes" (many of them amusing as well as informative in themselves), and the three appendices ("Chronology of Garrick's Writing for the Theatre," "Attendance Charts and Selected Receipts," and "A Statistical Survey of Eighteenth Century Theatre Repertoire") reveals the breadth and thoroughness of his research. Here we have—I think importantly—one of the very few socio-economic analyses of the twelve thousand weekly patrons (seventeen in every thousand of population) attending Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Fortunately the emphasis is upon that group which historians have so little information about—the frequenters of the lower-priced seats in the middle and upper galleries. Pedicord correlates the London workman's profession, wages, and working hours with theatre admission prices, curtain time, program of entertainment, and box office popularity and concludes that although the composition of Garrick's audience was heterogeneous, although men and women from all strata of society attended the playhouse, the theatre was essentially one of the upper-middle class.

Pedicord cites clear evidence to show that the earlier eighteenth-century spectators were not "the undesirable playgoers we have been led to consider them, and that later audiences were not as refined as some would have us believe." His lively discussion of the problems that Garrick faced as an alterer of plays and of the fate of his work when he tried to compromise in order to suit what he believed to be the taste of his audiences should be read by those inclined to damn him as a play-butcher.

The audiences of Garrick's day came for entertainment, not social or moral discipline, and judged what they saw accordingly. In general, they preferred pantomime and spectacle to other presentations; they preferred comedy to tragedy, and the plays of Shakespeare above others; and year after year they remained faithful to the old stock pieces.

Based almost entirely upon speeches and scenes, prologues and epilogues found in plays from Buckingham's *Rehearsal* to Sheridan's *Critic,* Smith's full and stimulating study places the author no less than the critic, whether professional or pittite, under microscopic investigation. In this hundred-year period of historical significance, much more sharply and pointedly than today, the author feared the critic in the audience and approached his first night with trepidation. That audience by the eighteenth century was composed not only of the new journalistic critics who came into existence with the rise of the newspaper and the periodical, but also of many playwrights, since they were usually admitted free, and of amateur dramatists who had to pay, both of whose comments were often prompted by envy. Add to these "The Town"—those men and women of wealth, position or intellect who felt it their duty to maintain the standards of true wit and good taste—and we can more readily understand the author's timid approach to this supreme court of public opinion.

Smith's analysis of the heterogeneous audience, as exemplified in dozens of plays—two of which by Macklin in the Larpent Collection at the Huntington Library we are grateful to find used as evidence—produces an interesting, sometimes surprising, and always *human* picture of a vigorous and extremely vocal age.

"Freedom of speech and action was regarded as the inalienable right of every citizen who had paid his admission at the door. . . . The tradition of free criticism in the auditorium of the theatre gave the public an increasing sense of the general rights of sovereignty and the immediate opportunity of exercising its own judgment and enforcing its own will. The *laws* which presumably supported the legality of the actions of the critic and the

validity of his judgments were the universally accepted canons of neoclassicism. . . ." Although some of the guilty went unpunished, Smith concludes that most of the plays which failed deserved to fail and that "the total effect of the voice and vote of these citizens of the pit was salutary and ever constructive."

ALBERT E. JOHNSON,
University of Texas

THE NEW WOMAN: HER EMERGENCE IN ENGLISH DRAMA, 1600-1730. By Jean Elizabeth Gagen. New York: Twayne Publishing Co., 1954: pp. 193. $3.50.

It is interesting and rewarding to read a book which so closely fulfills its claim. This purpose is to show the appearance in English drama of the "new woman." Miss Gagen chose the drama as her medium because, as she believes, the "new woman" emerges more significantly in drama than in any other art form of the time. This is because the theatre, which burgeoned brilliantly at the Restoration of Charles II, "mirrored contemporary social modes," and reflected "the changes in the status of women with especial vividness.

The emergence upon the dramatic scene of woman as champion of her rights was not an unprepared entrance. Such classic examples as Penelope, Aspasia, and Athena had heralded woman's cleverness, if not her superiority. In the sixteenth century, Isabella of Aragon, Lady Jane Grey, and Elizabeth of England had put their royal seal of approval on woman's right to intellectual attainments. Hence the seventeenth century was prepared for the bursting upon the scene of "Mad Madge"—Margaret Lucas, Duchess of Newcastle, and for the more sober entry of Aphra Behn and Susannah Centlivre. Aphra Behn introduced the first learned lady in Restoration comedy—Lady Knowell in *Sir Patient Fancy*. Susannah Centlivre introduced the first lady scientist in Restoration comedy—Valeria in *The Basset-Table*.

The new woman, as she is presented in Restoration drama, according to Miss Gagen, includes the dramatist, the scholar, the writer, the lawyer, the philosopher, the scientist, the militant leader, the witty conversationalist of the *salon*, and the well-poised and well-"proviso'd" wife. The chapters in the book which held most appeal to the reader were "The Lady and the Laboratory," "Daughters in Revolt," and "Ladies in Command."

"The Lady and the Laboratory" presents the lady scientist, a deviate from the lady skilled in tongues, both foreign and domestic. When the precedent-shattering visit of the Duchess of Newcastle was made to the recently-founded Royal Society, the event was echoed in a line from Wright's *The Female Vertuoso's*: "Woe then to the Royal Society: the Glory of it will suffer a Manifest Eclipse." In satirizing the science-mad female, the male writer holds up, in virtuous contrast, the wife of "common sense"; yet all is done with humor, mild or ribald, rather than scorn.

"Daughters in Revolt" touches a theme which has occurred often before this time, and which always receives sympathetic treatment. This is the protest of maidens against the arranging of unsuitable marriages for them by their parents or guardians. Even Sedley, arch-rake and libertine, bewails the tyranny shown to woman by denying her a choice of husbands. A series of well-chosen examples illustrate this aspect of the new woman. One of these, from *The Non-Juror*, is expressed thus: "If I must have an ill Match, I'll have the pleasure of playing my own game at least."

"Ladies in Command" shows contemporary woman, through the medium of the drama, in plays wherein she is not the ridiculous freak whose maid carries a writing desk on her back, nor the frantic skygazer with eye glued to telescope, but rather the sophisticated woman of fashionable society modelled on the court of Charles II. This type of new woman lays down her "provisoes" with the calm assumption of victory which is more than half the battle. Mrs. Sullen, Lady Brute, Lady Rodomont, and, pre-eminently, Millamant, "provide" the rights and privileges which may well be tantamount to conjugal law.

Thus, though the new woman is satirized by the Restoration dramatist, as Miss Gagen has shown, she is still respected. In her struggle for a more privileged existence, the contemporary dramatist shows her to be ridiculous, over-bearing, vain, self-willed. But one suspects, from the evidence given in this book, that these trivial traits and inconsistencies may be subterfuges necessary for entrance into the world of equal privilege. Woman, against such odds, must cultivate her garden, with wit if all else fail. So, through the ages, she has kept men guessing at her next unpredictable step. Like Cleopatra, age cannot wither her nor custom stale her infinite variety. This is why, in her charm and by her wizardry, she is eternally feminine and always new.

FAIRFAX PROUDFIT WALKUP,
University of Arizona

RENUNCIATION AS A TRAGIC FOCUS. By Eugene H. Falk. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954; pp. xvi+92. $3.00.

Despite its pretentiously-resounding title, this over-extended little book has really a very simple thesis and procedure. Without questioning "the validity of Butcher's definition"—and, presumably, Aristotle's—the author seeks to extend the basic concept of tragedy to include martyrdom or self-sacrifice which involves a renunciation of the will to live for a higher value: "Martyrdom and self-sacrifice are tragic if they emerge from a conflict between authentic worldly and spiritual aspirations."

"To show this," the author asserts, "I have chosen five plays in which the tragic experiences are of decreasing intensity." The plays are: Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* and *Antigone*, Corneille's *Polyeucte*, Maeterlinck's *Aglavaine and Selysette*, and Samain's *Polyphème*.

It seems to this reviewer that the author has failed to make his case because of the nature of his evidence and because of the arbitrary, even eccentric, interpretations he advances for the selected materials in an effort to bolster his thesis.

The basis of selection that limits the dramatic models to two Greek classic dramas and three French plays of relatively minor merit is nowhere explained (although the dust jacket does tell us that the author teaches romance languages). Certainly, at any rate, this sampling is qualitatively and quantitatively insufficient to justify any extensive application of conclusions, even were the author's other processes not seriously at fault.

For example, despite his strained ingenuity, Mr. Falk is unable to convince us that *Oedipus the King* is a tragedy because the protagonist is a *martyr* who renounces the will to live as an act of atonement. The more accepted views concerning this play and its protagonist seem to carry more weight; and there is no apparent need or reasonableness for this novel interpretation.

Again, in the face of the internal evidence of the script itself, as well as the best-considered, latter-day critical opinion, Mr. Falk chooses to consider Antigone, rather than Creon, the protagonist of Sophocles' drama. As H. D. F. Kitto (*Greek Tragedy*, p. 130) says on this point, "it is simply a matter of looking at the dramatic facts" to realize that Creon is the center of Sophocles' attention. Moreover, here, as elsewhere, Mr. Falk ignores the Butcher-Aristotelian concept of tragedy and the tragic hero—with which he ostensibly agrees basically—so that, were Antigone actually the protagonist, as he maintains, the "tragedy" would have a flawless or, according to Aristotle, non-tragic protagonist. This is a seemingly anomalous position for the author.

Still again, *Polyeucte* would seem to provide a protagonist who perfectly fulfills the Butcher-Aristotelian specifications for the true martyr character *who cannot be tragic* because his suffering and death pale in the glow of victory in moral triumph. Yet the author contravenes this apparently-accepted norm and fifty per cent of the total space devoted to the treatment of all the dramas he lavishes on this work, tortuously psychoanalyzing Polyeucte in an involved attempt to establish his dubious thesis that the character is a tragic hero. However, one is forced to agree with Butcher (*Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, fourth ed., p. 311, n. 1): "Corneille (Discours ii. *De la Tragédie*) objects to banishing martyrs from the stage, and adduces his own Polyeucte in support of his view—a very doubtful example."

Selysette has little or no resemblance to any hitherto-known criterion for a tragic hero. She is more a feeling vegetable than a tragic protagonist. In Mr. Falk's own words, she is "childlike"; she "does not reason" but her "experiences are felt," and her "feelings are, for the most part, only suggested by gestures. . . ." This does not deter Mr. Falk from trying to elevate Selysette to tragic status—without success, it need hardly be added.

Happily, the author at least makes no serious claim that *Polyphème* is a tragedy. Rather, he uses it to illustrate what tragic renunciation is not—something which his previous examples, even if unintentionally, amply illustrate.

Finally, it may fairly, if reluctantly, be said that the author has taken a small but potentially interesting idea that might have been advanced more modestly and appropriately in a short paper and he has elaborated it beyond reason to a length that is as excessive as the price of the book is inordinate. He has done this largely by forced argument, constant repetition, lengthy and unnecessary plot delineation, and by tiresomely re-treading ground already covered by more qualified authorities in the field of drama.

JOHN T. DUGAN,
The Catholic University of America

THE ACTOR'S WAYS AND MEANS. By Michael Redgrave. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1953; pp. 90. $3.00.

In four lectures delivered at Bristol Univer-

sity in 1952-53, now revised for publication. British actor Michael Redgrave exhibits a literate affection for his profession. He adds up the figures in his twenty year old theater ledger to discover that the true, full function of the actor is "not to think, not to feel, not to exhibitionize, not to make some personal statement . . . *but to act*," and then briefly proceeds to inquire "how this is done, what precedes it, what accompanies it, what lends it such dignity as it may claim, but above all what gives it force and meaning . . ." And the inventory is a happy one, although surprising in what it includes and slightly disappointing in what it omits.

The surprise in *The Actor's Ways and Means* is Redgrave's pleasant erudition: what he mostly adds up are the accumulated notes, his personal verifications, from a wide reading on the subject. He refers to Corax, Aristotle, Quintilian; he refreshingly decides that Hamlet's "Advice to the Players" actually tells us nothing about acting; he salutes Remond de Sainte-Abline's 1747 *Le Comédien;* he quotes from Fanny Kemble, Coquelin, Henry Irving, Walkley, Poel, Granville-Barker, Jouvet, Michael Chekhov, Proust, and scores of others; he devotes virtually an entire lecture to an examination of the Stanislavski method.

What Redgrave says about this "only successful attempt which has ever been made to come to terms with the fundamentals of the actor's art" is typical of many of his profitable findings. He is certain, for instance, that young or misguided actors who study it may be taught how to feel to an audience. Consequently, for the acting of Shakespeare (and for how many other playwrights, including our realistic ones?) he suggests that "an approach must be found which makes use of the Stanislavski method . . . but also of something similar to Meyerhold's 'bio-mechanics': the precept that 'If I do this and this, so and so will be the effect.'"

The slight disappointment in the book derives from Redgrave's minimum mention of his own personal experiences behind the acting of such characters as Orin in *Mourning Becomes Electra,* Rakitin in *A Month in the Country,* Charleston in *Thunder Rock,* Young Marlowe in *She Stoops to Conquer,* Richard II, Hotspur, Shylock, Macbeth, Lear, etc. The photographs of twenty-six of his varied roles indicate that Redgrave is not a "personality" actor, one who moulds each character in lines set by his own; he is instead a "Protean" actor, one who attempts to sink, or translate, or in some cases extend his own personality in the playwright's character. But he does not tell us much about his methods as a "Protean" performer. He says that even if he knew, he would not tell. Not all at any rate. For him, as for most of us, an understanding of the art or craft of acting remains largely a *mystique.*

Over-all, however, Redgrave's discursive and interim report, even though it lacks, perhaps intentionally, any synthesis, is constantly stimulating. Because it rephrases more or less the way in which actors in England and at this time have to live and work and have their being, it is recommended collateral reading.

EDWIN DUERR,
New York City

EVERY LITTLE MOVEMENT. By Ted Shawn. Pittsfield, Mass.: The Eagle Printing and Binding Company, 1954; pp. 115. $3.00.

To most people the work of François Delsarte has long been relegated to history. It has been some fifty years since any book advocating the Delsarte principles has been published. It will come as a surprise to many to find such a book in Ted Shawn's *Every Little Movement.*

Mr. Shawn has drawn upon the major sources of Delsartism, has brought together the various interpretations, has pointed out varying terminologies and theories, and has made a complete restatement of Delsarte principles. The word restatement is used by choice because Mr. Shawn has not attempted to add anything to Delsartism but has put the basic elements of the theory into twentieth-century language which makes for better comprehension than the occasional extravagances of some of the nineteenth-century material.

The book is in four sections: I. François Delsarte, the Man and his Philosophy; II. A Statement of the Laws of Delsarte's Science; III. Application of the Laws to the Art of the Dance; IV. The Influence of Delsarte on the Art of the Dance.

Section I is largely biographical and presents general background material. Section II summarizes the concepts of Delsartism. The word Delsartism is here used rather than Delsarte for it is impossible, at least for the present, to separate absolutely the ideas of Delsarte from those of certain of his pupils, chiefly Steele MacKaye—and possibly also those of Gustave Delsarte, the teacher of W. R. Alger and Henrietta Russell who married the poet Richard Hovey and with whom Mr. Shawn studied for many years.

Mr. Shawn draws his study of Delsartism from two major sources—his study with Mrs.

Hovey, and the major books dealing with Delsartism—Delaumosne and Arnaud, Genevieve Stebbins, Anna Morgan, Emily Bishop, Marion Lowell, etc.

Section II presents a sound summary of Delsartism. It is, unfortunately, perhaps too brief for the beginner. The ramifications of the Delsarte system are extensive and the casual reader is apt to get lost. More illustrative material might help, and in later editions, which Mr. Shawn suggests, possibly the problem will be met.

The most interesting sections of the book to this reviewer are sections III and IV dealing with the application of the system to the dance and the influence of Delsartism on modern dance. Most Delsarte historians, who are interested in Delsartism as a method of teaching "elocution," abandon the project after the extravagances of the later period—statue posing and the like—and assume that Delsartism simply died out. It is intriguing to discover that Delsartism had moved into a realm of pure movement—the dance—and, according to Mr. Shawn, opened up an entire new field.

This reviewer is not competent to judge Mr. Shawn's contention that modern dance is founded on Delsarte—other reviewers may resolve this issue—but Mr. Shawn should know. It is clear that, as he states, Shawn, Isadora Duncan, and Ruth St. Denis were the founders of modern dance.

The book suggests a number of interesting possibilities for further studies. Mr. Shawn himself proposes to translate the work of Giroudet. Research should be undertaken, if there are sources available, on Gustave Delsarte as well as a number of American Delsartians. The whole field of Delsartism in Europe is virtually unexplored.

The closing section of the book contains an annotated bibliography. Mr. Shawn has covered the major sources including some valuable periodical items. Possibly MacKaye's four articles in *Werner's Magazine* for April, May, June, and August, 1887, should be included, and possibly also S. S. Curry's summary in *The Province of Expression*. It may be noted in passing that materials referred to by Mr. Shawn as being deposited at Louisiana State University, are, after a long period of extremely close restriction by a former owner and potential publisher, now officially the property of Louisiana State University and are freely available to anyone through the Archives Department.

CLAUDE L. SHAVER,
Louisiana State University

ORAL DECISION-MAKING: Principles of Discussion and Debate. By Waldo W. Braden and Earnest S. Brandenburg. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955; pp. xii+572. $4.75.

". . . We have attempted to write a textbook which realistically presents discussion and debate as related counterparts of a larger process which we have called oral decision-making. . . . We have sought to integrate with traditional principles of discussion and debate many concepts and approaches which have been developed recently in related fields." Having said this in their Preface the authors proceed to do these things exceptionally well. In so doing, they have added a very significant volume to the literature in this field.

With an attractive format, many illustrations of discussion in action, and a fresh, lively style of writing, the book makes for pleasant, practical, yet scholarly reading that will satisfy a variety of reader audiences. This reviewer finds the primary reader objective to be the college student in the discussion and/or debate course, yet the discussion instructor, the debate coach, the industrial relations or training director, and many others should find it rewarding.

The plan and arrangement are quite logical and clear, with a progression through Parts One and Two dealing with Oral Decision-Making through Discussion to Part Three dealing with Reaching Decisions through Debate. This balance appears sound. It is interesting that the authors emphasize "decision-making" both in their title and in the philosophy of the book, treating discussion and debate as the chief methods for reaching decisions in a democracy. In making the transition from the treatment of discussion principles to debate, there is an implication that they are more mutually exclusive processes than this reviewer feels is the case, and that debate does not occur during "discussion." However, the authors handle the transition admirably.

Outstanding is the way in which the authors combine the traditional principles with the newer trends, particularly in discussion, such as group dynamics, sociometrics, and role-playing. The latter, for example, is discussed at some length, including the concepts of psychodrama and sociodrama. The uses that can be made of these techniques in the discussion meeting could be pointed up more sharply.

After laying a foundation for the nature and materials of discussion in Part One, in which they have unusually good chapters on evaluating facts and argument and a valuable treatment of language in discussion, the authors

proceed in Part Two to take up the meat of the discussion process in one of the best developments of this subject seen by this reviewer. Interesting distinctions are made between public and private discussion. The chapter on the outline or agenda includes good examples. (These two terms are considered interchangeable, whereas this reviewer would use the term agenda as describing the subjects and continuity of the meeting given to the participants and not the leader's detailed preparation and plan which is his outline.) Participation in discussion, often neglected by writers in this field, has excellent treatment, emphasizing interpersonal relations. Evaluation methods and techniques are presented with many very useful forms for charting discussion in action and such presently popular methods as the observer and feedback.

As already indicated, Part Three deals with Debate and occupies about one-third of the volume. This treatment is thorough and complete, yet concise and to the point. Proposition analysis, briefing, case development, and refutation are considered fully and well. Particularly valuable is the emphasis on persuasion in debate and the healthy regard for the debater's relations with his audience. Though they rightly include tournament debating in their chapter on the types and forms of debate, one does not get the impression that they are writing for the debater in an empty room. Audience adaptation, rapport, and the total process of "presenting a debate" point up their philosophy of debate as a democratic decision-making tool. There is a freshness to the development which is stimulating and enriching.

The debate coach will not find any of the orthodox concepts neglected; on the contrary, he and others will be surprised at the depth of treatment the authors have packed into these pages. The debate judge will find useful suggestions and methods in the chapter on Evaluating Debate. The chairman or member of a meeting using parliamentary procedure will find a brief but good treatment of this subject in the last chapter.

The entire book is replete with exercises and bibliographies which show that the authors have drawn on many authorities as well as their own backgrounds. *Oral Decision-Making* should take its place among the leading works in the field of discussion and debate as a comprehensive, thorough, and keenly analytical book written for both textbook and reference use.

HAROLD P. ZELKO,
The Pennsylvania State University

SPEECH: DYNAMIC COMMUNICATION. By Milton Dickens. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954; pp. 440. $4.50.

This is a first-course book of some twenty chapters divided into five parts: Introduction, Speech Materials, Speech Delivery, Speech Construction, and Basic Speech Processes. To "render the materials easy to learn and easy to teach" the author explains that he has adopted an informal style of writing, attempted to use practical examples drawn from the experiences of students, and used "for illustrative purposes candid camera shots of student speakers." The text contains dozens of photographs, many of full-page size, nearly 150 in all.

Students will like these features of the book. Theory is easily set forth, examples are plentiful, and the pages are laid out in an attractive way. Each chapter is preceded by a topical outline; it is followed by a concise summary. The appendix contains a class schedule for two semesters and the phonetic alphabet. For practical audience analyses forms are included for the composition of the audience and audience attitudes on current affairs.

Teachers should be attracted to this book because of its sound principles, good sequence of assignments, and general readability. Some will complain that much of the theory is "written down," that it will not challenge the best students, and that the choice of pictures is not always apt or convincing. But these comments are offset by the many virtues of the book. The author has avoided the extremes of being too new-fangled or too old-fashioned. He has fortunately remembered that his audience is composed of beginning speech students rather than specialists or research scholars.

An Instructor's Manual has also been published for this textbook. It is divided into five sections dealing with (1) The text and Appendices, (2) Criticism of the Student Speaker, (3) Student Evaluation of Speech Courses, (4) Interclass Speaking Contest, and (5) Suggested Examination Questions. Since the information is all based on years of observation and teaching of a first course, instructors will find a large number of useful ideas. For each chapter some twenty to fifty True-False questions are provided. The inexperienced teacher will find the manual a stimulating aid.

HAROLD F. HARDING,
Ohio State University

READING ALOUD EFFECTIVELY. By Ben Graf Henneke. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1954; pp. 481. $5.00.

Here is a clear, simple, practical book for the orientation and instruction of the layman, particularly the layman with small literary background. The student of Oral Reading or Radio Reading will find adequate instruction in how to read material which is, from the standpoint of meaning, relatively uncomplicated. The author's approach is in contrast with that of Charlotte Lee (*Oral Interpretation*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952). Where Miss Lee stresses the literary and aesthetic values involved in oral interpretation, Mr. Henneke emphasizes pragmatic communication problems of the "How to Do it" variety. Occasionally it appears that Mr. Henneke is becoming unnecessarily elementary in considering problems of material choice. On page 53 he states: "If the audience is interested solely in football, *Casey at the Bat* may be inappropriate, but Casey may be more appropriate than a selection from a minor lyric poet." Perhaps he is more concerned with the pleasing of an audience with material selected for their average level, than with how to use artistry and skill to raise standards of appreciation—individual and group. What is "good literature" and what may "go" in a specific reading situation may be two different things, but the academic aim should be to make what is "good" literature "go."

Mr. Henneke's sound system for pronunciation may prove popular with the layman, but for the speech person, instruction in phonetic symbols would be preferable.

The writing of this book appears to have been influenced strongly by Radio and Adult Education interests. It would appear to be most suitable for these categories.

JOHN ROBSON,
Kansas State College

THE ART OF SPEAKING MADE SIMPLE. By William R. Gondin and Edward W. Mammen. New York: Made Simple Books, Inc., 1954; pp. 188. $1.00.

Our present how-to-do-it-yourself fad has produced innumerable popularly priced self-help books. It was inevitable that a volume on how-to-speak-in-public should join the paper-backed ranks. *The Art of Speaking Made Simple* is not a salesman's manual nor a personality development and self-culture course as are many speech books keyed to the general public. Neither is it the unique and revolutionary method of learning public speaking that is announced on the cover by a publisher interested in sales promotion. This is simply a textbook in general speech aimed at the understanding of the pocket book reading public, a popularized digest that may satisfy those seeking a simple introduction to public speaking for everyday use.

The general faults of this work are: (1) the authors attempt to cover too much with too little, and (2) they give too little space to the "art of speaking" and too much to the techniques. While the authors claim that each chapter is a complete entity, the reader cannot hope to obtain more than a smattering of understanding from any of them. Conversation is handled in fourteen pages, interviewing in fifteen. Public speaking, including radio and TV speaking and speech composition, is "completed" in thirty-three pages. Parliamentary procedure is considered important enough to warrant twenty-five pages, and discussion techniques are given nineteen. Elocution receives the most space from the authors with sixty-six pages devoted to vocal development, pronunciation, articulation, and foreign accent.

The severe condensation of public address limits necessary explanations and encourages didactic rules. The reader is constantly admonished in an aphoristic style to "be healthily and ostentatiously confident," "phone as you are phoned to," "think what you are saying while you are saying it. Think it hard," etc. Insufficient space is allotted to reasons for obeying these rules, or to incentive to want to try them. The reader must bring his own "fire to these faggots."

The chapters on vocal development and pronunciation are comparable to similar chapters in standard speech texts. It is puzzling, however, why the words selected for pronunciation correction include so many words that the general non-college public do not have in their vocabulary, e.g., *flaccid*, *lugubrious*, *egregious*. Speech teachers may question many of the authors' pronunciation recommendations, such as [ˈkæliop] for *calliope*. Phoneticians will question the elimination of tension as a distinguished feature of vowel sounds, the description of [e] as always the diphthongal [eɪ] and the description of [ɜ] as a high central sound.

On the other hand, there is sound advice tucked away in many sections of this book, such as "let the test of gesture be that it is decisive, significant, and unostentatious." There is good use made of contemporary examples, there is a very usable section on formal and informal procedure in parliamentary discussion, and there are many clear illustrations and

diagrams. While simplification has led to an unfortunate condensation and a questionable allotting of space, it has not resulted in loss of standards. The standards of good speaking are upheld throughout the book.

ROY F. HUDSON,
University of Wichita

THE VOICE OF NEUROSIS. By Paul J. Moses. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954; pp. 131. $4.00.

The assumption that there exists a strong relation between voice and personality is a commonplace of literature, folklore, and speech textbooks. Adequate statement of that relation, however, is complicated by the wide variety of learning phenomena which affect it, and the almost equally wide variety of backgrounds from which the necessary basic analysis has proceeded. Dr. Moses' book offers a system of analysis and a body of observation and interpretation of neurotic voice made through his system.

His analysis method is more complex than most, and covers a wider range. Dr. Moses distinguishes "Acoustic Dimensions," or approaches to the voice as voice; "Other Dimensions," or essentially those of the voice in use in time; and finally, a group of "Other Significant Features," which might be called measures of the voice as used in social communication: Pathos, Mannerism, Melism, Exactness, and Pauses between words. The last group is more unusual in the speech field than are the others, and is suggestive of study techniques not only in voice improvement but also in public speaking.

The other content of the book is limited by intention to the neurotic voice, and is aimed at filling the gap caused by the fact that "the training of the psychiatrist does not contain the analysis of the voice, and the training of the laryngologist does not include sufficient psychiatric understanding of the emotional problems which affect the voice." From a speech standpoint it is difficult to evaluate. The interpretations stem from a wide range of sources, but are essentially psychoanalytic. They suffer, as psychoanalytic work so often does, from a confusion of observation and interpretation. For instance, in speaking of oral gratification as a factor in speech development, Dr. Moses says that "Children like to lisp because it involves a similar kind of enjoyment. Lisping may . . . be continued longer than usual . . . because of a certain confusion. 'Th' is a lisped 'S'; and it is rather hard for the child to understand why lisping is sometimes allowed and sometimes not." But very many children are late in producing "Th" at all, and the typical stop substitution hardly suggests such a confusion. He says that "Meeting a 'foreigner' necessitates broad experiences and an open mind to avoid the archaic fear reaction. This is the reason most inexperienced people in conversation with foreigners raise their voices instead of pronouncing more carefully." The simpler explanation, that most inexperienced people are relying on the fact that increased loudness has often brought increased comprehension, eludes him.

Dr. Moses writes in simple assertive sentences, often with a fine disregard for contextual relations, and there is to this reviewer a question as to whether some of the apparent weaknesses of the book are not really simply stylistic. Dr. Moses probably does not mean literally that "Low tones are just that; they receive their resonance low in the chest," or "The soft palate is *solely* responsible for the gliding change from mouth to nose or naso-pharynx." And whether he does or not, much of the book is very perceptive and valuable. His concept of the "persona" as an adjustment technique to be considered in time and space, his distinction between the neurotic and the "nervous" voice, his notes on the technique of "creative listening" are helpful and suggestive.

The book needs to be read carefully, warily, and with its limitation to the neurotic voice held firmly in mind. So read it is a valuable contribution to voice-personality study.

PAUL C. BOOMSLITER,
New York State College for Teachers, Albany

THE PHONETIC ALPHABET. By Frances A. Cartier. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1954; pp. 58. $1.50.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN PHONETIC ALPHABET. By Florence E. Angier and Wallace B. Conant. Concord, Massachusetts: Anglo-American Phonetics, Inc., 1953; pp. 68.

The Phonetic Alphabet is a workbook designed to "aid the teaching of the phonetic alphabet." Cartier accomplishes this purpose in five divisions: broad transcription, reading transcribed material, transcription of connected speech, intonation, and narrow transcription. Each section is preceded by brief introductory material, including keys and charts, and followed by exercises on perforated, well-spaced pages suitable for hand-in work.

As a quick sample, one can find in the introductory material brief discussions of phonemes, allophones, accent, stress, dialectal forms, other phonetic systems, assimilation, doubling, tonemes, allotones and modifying symbols. In general, this workbook is not as extensive as either the Wise and Morgan or the Van Riper and Smith workbooks. However, it has the advantages of better physical arrangement and greater convenience for student and teacher use.

A few minor errata occur, but generally the book is remarkably free from errors. In this reviewer's opinion, the use of a connecting loop under the diphthong symbols is unnecessary. The same opinion is held of the inclusion of a separate symbol for the post-vocalic *l*, since this is primarily a phonemics workbook. The author's occasional use of the unstressed syllable of a bi-syllabic key word to illustrate vowel pronunciation seems of doubtful value.

However, these objections are relatively slight when Cartier's uniformly good job is considered. Of greater importance is the question of whether there is a need for more books on phonemic alphabets. Perhaps there is, insofar as they free the instructor to teach phonetics. Cartier's workbook should accomplish this.

After discussing the need for a spelling reform of English in *The Anglo-American Phonetic Alphabet*, the authors attempt to reconcile "the disparity between the spoken and written word." Angier and Conant purport to "take little account of words spoken in affectation and dialectal expressions," but "to set forth in new text the language of common speech." A series of modified symbols are introduced and unfortunately the authors describe only a few. A pronunciation guide for their entire alphabet should have been included. The main body of the book consists of some 4,850 words presented first in standard spelling and followed by Angier and Conants' pronunciation in their alphabet. In this are many curious things; for example, in the first word, "abaft," the same symbol is found representing both vowels. The second word, "abandon," has the first two vowels represented as in "abaft" while the third vowel is represented by another symbol.

Thus in the first two words two rules of phonetic representation are violated; first, no symbol should represent more than one phoneme, and second, a separate symbol should be used for each phoneme. Examples involving other symbols and sounds may be found on any page. A second major fault is the use of regional dialect forms in a book proposing to take "no account" of such forms. For example, one can find the words "aura," "comma," and "extra," to mention a few, represented as having final sounds as the "ar" in "car." It is interesting to note that "father" and "farther" have the same pronunciation. The "war" in "war" and "warm" are pronounced like the "wa" in "wall" which is reported as identical to the "wa" in "watt."

Let these few examples suffice. The reformation fails to reform.

R. S. Brubaker,
Pennsylvania State University

GROUP RELATIONS AT THE CROSS-ROADS. Edited by Muzafer Sherif and M. O. Wilson. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. viii+379. $3.50.

The second conference in Social Psychology, which was held at the University of Oklahoma, April 10-14, 1952, brought together a commanding array of talent in the field of group relations. This conference on Social Psychology has been repeated annually during the past several years. Each year a new or somewhat different theme is the center of attention at the Conference. Muzafer Sherif was the co-ordinator of the second conference and contributes two important statements in the volume of readings. His first statement, entitled "Glance at Group Relations at the Cross Roads, An Introduction," summarizes in brief the essence of the whole work and gives an over-view of the seminar. Later on Sherif reports some of his work on reference groups.

A glance at the Table of Contents should give some idea of the substance of this work. John P. Scott discusses "Infra-Human Social Behavior" and its implications for human relations, and Anne Anastasi discusses "Psychological Traits and Group Relations" with an interesting reference to the psycho-metric adaptation. Anselm Strauss in a short paper attempts to pull together "Concepts, Communication and Groups." It is the feeling of this reviewer that the area of all three suffers somewhat by the necessary brevity required to cover so wide a series of items. James J. Gibson does a very interesting job in presenting ideas on "Social Perception and The Psychology of Perceptual Learning." He outlines nine hypotheses of perceptual learning based on the work of E. J. Gibson. These are significant at least for their implications for research and education. Gardner Murphy, in a paper on "Knowns and Unknowns in the Dynamics of Social Perception," poses an interesting question concern-

ing the limitations of the provincial research in the several areas. He says, "Maybe we need a frame of reference for the studies of Social Perception which is really big enough to hold the phenomena which are to be explained." Robert E. Farris presents a rather thorough and comprehensive study of the "Development of the Small Group Research Movement." This, your reviewer feels, was one of the more interesting and thorough of the papers presented in the Conference. This, of course, is a biased view. Herbert Bloomer, in discussing the "Psychological Import of the Human Group," feels that "the development of a realistic social psychology is especially dependent upon an empirically valid picture of the nature of human association."

Muzafer Sherif's second paper deals with the concept of reference groups in human relations. In this he points out the significant difference between reference groups and membership groups and characterizes reference groups as "those groups to which the individual relates himself or to which he aspires to relate himself as a part psychologically." He claims that the use of the reference group concept is a quite promising one in the study of group relations because it has been verified in the various laboratory studies, several of which he cites in his paper. Leon Festinger reports on an "Analysis of Compliant Behavior." In this chapter, Festinger analyzes some of the interesting implications of behavior which conforms *with* acceptance and behavior which conforms *without* acceptance of a suggested line of behavior. One of the more significant papers in the series of reports is the work done by Carter on "Leadership in Small Group Behavior." Carter emphasizes the variable position and role of the leader within the group. His point, that a leader does not lead all the time in all situations nor does he obtain his role once and for all, is expressed quite strongly and supported with considerable evidence. However, Carter did call attention to the tremendous inadequacy of the present investigations in the field of leadership in contrast to the tremendous complexity of the problems that are involved. Mozell Hill branches over into Sherif's particular field and discusses some problems of "Social Distance in Inter-Group Relations." Hill suggests that the approach to the study of inter-group relations involves examination of the variables in the different strata of society and of different whole societies. He does call attention to the point that he believes the social distance concept of R. E. Park is a convenient and useful frame for studying certain aspects of group interaction. One of the important points that he makes to the field of speech is that he finds that the concept of attitudes as "tendencies" or "predispositions to act" does not fit and is of relatively little value in social distance studies. Nelson Foote and Clyde Hart presented a paper attempting to bring together the business of public opinion and collective behavior. There is a strong appeal for longitudinal type studies in the field of public opinion and behavior. The authors discuss five stages of opinion formation of interest to speech people: the Problem Phase, Crystallization of Proposal Phase, Policy Phase, Decision Phase, and Action Phase. In the last chapter, Helen Hall Jennings discusses the "Sociometric Structure in Personality and Group Formation." Many of us are familiar with Miss Jennings' work in Sociometry and this paper carries on in the tradition of her pamphlet, "Sociometry and Group Relations."

On the whole, this book of collected papers by Sherif and Wilson is highly interesting and stimulating. It brings up many of the basic issues in the study of group relations for both large group and small group research. In addition, it points out some of the problems in the organization and development of concepts and ideas which form basic hypotheses for study of these problems. I would suggest that it is a book which anyone in speech who presumes to deal with the science or practice of human group behavior should examine carefully.

JOHN KELTNER,
Kansas State College

MOTIVATION AND PERSONALITY. By A. H. Maslow. New York: Harper & Bros., 1954; pp. xiv+409. $4.50.

With human motivation as the central theme this book presents a thorough treatment of several factors which are important to speech and communication teachers. Without mentioning speech directly the author throws light upon the underlying conscious and unconscious needs which contribute to speech behavior; and upon hidden, unspoken, and complex factors which operate in persuasion, learning, mental health, personality, and character.

In addition to the physiological, safety, belongingness, love, and esteem needs, he adds the needs for self-actualization (for the individual to do what he is fitted for), the desires to know and understand, and the aesthetic needs. These basic need gratifications do not necessarily operate in the priority listed

above; sometimes there are reversals in the order given, as in some innately creative people.

Persons who have been satisfied in their basic needs throughout their lives, particularly in their younger years, seem to develop exceptional power to withstand present or future thwarting of these needs because they have strong, healthy character structure as a result of basic satisfactions. "They are the strong people who can easily weather disagreement or opposition, who can swim against the stream of public opinion, and can stand up for the truth at great personal cost. It is just the ones who have lived and been well loved, and who have had many deep friendships who can hold out against hatred, rejection, or persecution."

On the whole these needs are more often unconscious than conscious, and the unconscious motivations on the whole are more important than the conscious motivations. However, what we have called "unconscious needs may with sophisticated people become conscious. Everyday conscious desires are to be regarded as symptoms, as surface indicators of more basic needs." If we were to take these superficial desires at their face value we would find ourselves in a state of complete confusion that could never be resolved, since we would be dealing seriously with symptoms rather than what lay behind the symptoms.

The healthy man is primarily motivated by his needs to develop and actualize his fullest potentialities and capacities. If a man has any other needs in any active, chronic sense, he is simply an unhealthy man. Thwarting of basically important needs does produce psychopathological results; thwarting of unimportant desires does not. A conflict or a frustration is not necessarily pathogenic. "It becomes so only when it threatens or thwarts the basic needs or partial needs that are closely related to the basic needs."

The degree of need gratification is positively correlated with degree of psychological health. With need gratification the person is released for self-actualization in line with the growth tendency which, from within, drives him to fuller development. The author challenges assumptions that health is achieved through "asceticism, through renunciation of basic needs, through discipline, and through tempering in the fire of frustrations, tragedy, and unhappiness." The higher needs will not even appear in consciousness, until lower, more prepotent needs are gratified. Thus need gratification is a determinant of need frustration. The merely surviving man will not worry much over the higher things of life. It takes a certain amount of gratification of lower needs to elevate him to a point where he is civilized enough to feel frustrated about the larger personal, social, and intellectual issues.

The author points out the importance of protecting the weak, subtle, and tender instinctoid needs if they are not to be overwhelmed by the tougher, more powerful culture. These weak needs, although mainly inherited, are easily repressed, suppressed or otherwise controlled. They are easily masked or modified or even suppressed by habits, suggestions, by cultural patterns, by guilt and so on. Our society must be considerably improved before weakly hereditary needs may expect gratification.

A chief implication of this book for speech teachers is that we should contribute to making our students self-actuating and at the same time mentally healthy. Self-actuating people have a more efficient perception of reality and more comfortable relations with it; they accept themselves, others, and nature; they are relatively spontaneous; they are focused on problems outside of themselves; they have detachment; they have a greater independence from their culture, a continued freshness of appreciation; they discriminate between ends and means; they are democratic people, in the deepest possible sense; they are philosophical with an unhostile sense of humor; they have more creativeness.

Only in the sick society and the sick individual is there an antagonism between instincts and society. In the "good" society individual and social interests contribute to each other and are not antagonistic. Any belief that makes men mistrust themselves and each other unnecessarily, and to be unrealistically pessimistic about human possibilities, "must be held partly responsible for every war that has ever been waged, for every racial antagonism, and for every religious crusade."

The book is a synthesis of the holistic, dynamic, and cultural approaches. It points out the unsuitability of a psychology for the normal based on either animal researches or upon data from the highly abnormal. The reviewer considers this volume to make a definite advance which will influence speech and communication methodology in the years to come.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver.

I LOOKED AND I LISTENED. By Ben Gross. New York: Random House, 1954: pp. vii+311, $3.95.

PRAISED AND DAMNED: THE STORY OF FULTON LEWIS, Jr. By Booton Herndon. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1954: pp. 147. $2.00.

The name of Ben Gross may or may not be familiar to many of us; however, his book "I Looked and I Listened" prompts fascinating reminiscences for all of us who have tuned the dials of radio sets.

With the exception of a very few early years, the author's radio (now radio-television) column in the *New York Daily News* spans the entire history of broadcasting in this country. His personal and varied experiences with the industry, its growth and its personalities, make Ben Gross a natural for telling this story.

One has the feeling that Mr. Gross has enjoyed his years as radio-television editor, for his record sparkles with amusing and interesting recollections.

The story of American broadcasting is mirrored in the lives of the people who caused it to grow. Gross knew these people and he writes of them and their experiences. The story is more than a collection of wonderful tales. It is a story of the growth of a great industry which has touched the people and influenced their lives to degrees yet unmeasured. Here is a very informal history but one which has a living and personal quality about it.

Phases of the book which merit special attention are those which treat the birth of the networks, program development, and the microphone in politics. The brief history of television is also included in these recollections. Indeed, the author leaves his readers with an interesting guess about "TV and The Future."

The student of broadcasting will find this story an interesting and worthwhile reading assignment. All others who have "looked and listened" will have memories recalled with a happy chuckle.

An individual broadcasting personality is treated biographically in a second new release. It is undoubtedly difficult for a biographer to remain objective in setting down the life story of his subject. Perhaps the reserve of objectivity is not always to be desired. It is the opinion of this reviewer that Mr. Herndon did not hold too tightly to objectivity in telling the story of Fulton Lewis Jr. Indeed, the author's glorification of news commentator Lewis may appear to many readers as overdone.

The motivation for the book seems to lie in the notation that Mr. Lewis is "more widely praised and damned than any other commentator. . . ." The biographer then proceeds to describe why the controversy should be resolved on a note of "praise."

The book makes for interesting reading but leaves one wondering if the case hasn't been overstated just a bit.

JOHN P. HIGHLANDER,
University of Wisconsin

TECHNIQUES OF TELEVISION PRODUCTION. By Rudy Bretz. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953; pp. x+474. $10.00.

This book was written to help to bridge the gap which frequently exists between the engineer and the producer in television. It is based on the theory that even a little knowledge of the other fellow's job will make it easier to co-operate with him, provided one knows the limits of that little bit of knowledge.

The book succeeds in what it has set out to do and also produces a valuable by-product. It should not only enhance the relationships between engineers and non-engineers, but also between other branches of the production staff. Furthermore, it can provide a lot of useful information to the beginner in television.

The make-up of the book reflects the author's preference for the part which the graphic arts play in television. Indeed, about one third of the work is given up to this branch. The reader may wish for similar detail in other sections.

The engineer reading the book to "see how the other half lives" may find a number of annoyances and over-simplifications. He will perhaps feel that even the non-technical reader would be better off with a bit more information about such terms as "secondary emission," if they are to be used at all. However this simplification may influence the informed reader, the beginner should be thankful for it, but understand that he is only getting a beginner's course.

The book is organized around the actual layout of jobs which might be found in a large network station. Frequent consideration is given to the problems of the small station and the multiplying of duties which such a situation presents. All production phases are covered but with varying amounts of detail.

As a whole, this seems to be a worthwhile book for the newcomer in television or the person who has specialized to an extreme degree in a large station. It is nowhere intensive, except possibly the graphic arts section. It is clearly, easily written and contains nothing which the uninformed reader cannot follow. The experienced television man may find his

particular specialty thinly covered, but he will probably learn something about the other man's job. This is what the author intended.

WILLARD BELLMAN,
Washington University

THE PSALMS IN RHYTHMIC PROSE. Translated by James A. Kleist and Thomas J. Lynam. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1954; pp. 236. $4.00.

THE NEW TESTAMENT: THE KING JAMES VERSION IN CADENCED FORM. Designed by Morton C. Bradley, Jr. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1954; pp. 615. $5.00.

The Psalms, translated by James A. Kleist and Thomas J. Lynam, will have special value for Roman Catholics, since it is based on the recent "authorized Latin version rendered from the original texts by members of the Pontifical Biblical Institute." But for non-Catholics who are familiar with the various translations of recent years, this version will not be particularly noteworthy.

Moreover, it is difficult to understand the fine distinction which the translators draw between poetry and rhythmic prose. "There is no intention," they say, "of a metrical rendition [as if this were the essential mark of poetry]; a merely rhythmical rendition is presented." But unfortunately, in this translation as in other modern translations, the rhythm is so arbitrary sometimes and the word-choice so studied that the desired "language of everyday life" is lost.

The New Testament in Cadenced Form, designed by Morton C. Bradley, Jr., will have special value for a different group of persons. It is an arrangement of the most highly regarded English translation of Protestantism.

By "cadenced form," Mr. Bradley means "a systematic arrangement of prose that permits better and easier reading." The solid block of the King James text is broken up and spread over the page according to a grammatical pattern. The smallest unit is the "cadence," which occupies a separate line. Succeeding cadences follow upon each other closely. Complete sentences are separated from each other by spaces a bit wider; and sentence-groups, paragraphs, and sections are separated from each other by spaces that widen progressively. Varying indentations are employed also, and quotations are set off by italics.

This scheme of printing is a definite help to the thoughtful reader, since the English of the King James version is a bit complex and archaic; and it serves especially well the more particular need of the oral interpreter. It should be pointed out, however, that there is no attempt at coloration of thought; and there is no suggestion of vocal effects to be followed—other than those dictated by logical necessity. In fact, the main value of the printing arrangement is that it makes structural relationships so immediately clear that the oral interpreter can respond more fully to the meaning, thereby enabling him to employ, unconsciously, those subtleties of voice and manner which indicate spontaneity and make the written word come alive for the listener.

The King James version of the New Testament—that version unmatched in literary values—will be welcomed in "cadenced form" by ministers who are concerned for the enrichment of public worship. It should not be surprising, then, if a demand is created also for the Old Testament in this form.

E. WINSTON JONES,
Boston University

BRIEFLY NOTED

EXAMINING FOR APHASIA: A MANUAL FOR THE EXAMINATION OF APHASIA AND RELATED DISTURBANCES. By Jon Eisenson (Rev. ed.) New York: Psychological Corp., 1954; pp. 78. $3.50.

The years since Professor Eisenson's Manual first appeared in 1946 have seen a continuing growth of interest in the problems of the aphasic. The Veterans Administration has maintained treatment centers in certain of its hospitals throughout the country, physicians are coming to learn [slowly] that the speech pathologist can often aid the language recovery of their brain-injured patients, and all of the larger college speech clinics offer academic and practical training in aphasia rehabilitation. Both a cause and an effect of this increasing interest has been a substantial amount of research in all facets of this complex disorder. Professor Eisenson has drawn upon this rapidly growing body of theoretical knowledge and upon the experience of himself and others in using the test when he states that two main purposes underlie this revision of the Manual: (a) to provide the clinician with expository material for understanding the problem of aphasia and the problems of the aphasic, and (b) to provide the author with an opportunity to present improvements in the examination materials and techniques."

The first of these purposes is accomplished by a discussion of the language, intellectual, and personality disturbances of the aphasic, a description of some useful tests of intellectual changes, and a section devoted to the differential diagnosis of the congenitally aphasic child. Except for about two pages none of this material is in the first edition, and it represents a major and very worthwhile addition to the Manual. Incidentally, Eisenson repeats here his disbelief of Kurt Goldstein's claim that brain damage in the adult leads to a wide incidence of loss of abstract attitude. The former feels that "It might be more nearly correct to look upon the adult aphasic as one who may be suffering from a relative *disinclination to assume and use the abstract* attitude rather than as one who has an actual impairment or loss of abstract attitude."

The second purpose is achieved mainly by providing more detailed instructions for administration and by broadening the range of difficulty of the test items. The illustrations, reading material, and other printed visual stimuli are large and clear as in the first edition —one of the advantages of this test over another frequently used test for aphasia.

The value of the Manual has been appreciably increased by this 1954 revision and it will undoubtedly continue to be one of the most widely used tests of aphasic disturbances.

JAMES V. FRICK,
The Pennsylvania State University

HANDBOOK FOR DISCUSSION LEADERS. By J. Jeffery Auer and Henry Lee Ewbank. (Rev. ed.) New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954; pp. 153. $2.50.

The authors' claim to having made a complete revision of their 1947 handbook is substantiated by a comparison of the two volumes. The work has grown from 118 pages in the 1947 edition to 153 pages in the present volume. Materials are brought up to date and the scope of the work is broadened. Brief discussions of role playing, "buzz sessions," and the case method of discussion take cognizance of innovations in discussion techniques. Chapter Two, "Understanding the Nature of Group Behavior," presents in jargon-free language some elementary ideas about the characteristics of groups and the concept of group leadership.

The book is, as its dust-wrapper proclaims, "A practical manual of conference techniques." Its emphasis is upon the basic problems the inexperienced leader faces—how to plan for, organize, lead, and evaluate the more common of the many discussion forms. The presentation is lucid; the advice practical. Readers familiar with the Ewbank and Auer textbooks in discussion will recognize much that is familiar in the materials and the treatment. The concept of discussion as an essential tool of democracy shapes the presentation.

Though this book is directed at those who are looking for practical helps in leading discussion, it will also serve well those who need a brief textbook for adult short courses. The authors anticipate this use and provide in the appendix a helpful list of suggested projects for discussion classes.

This handbook succeeds in presenting in brief compass the essentials of discussion techniques and a philosophy of discussion that employs those techniques to further the democratic process.

VICTOR M. POWELL,
Wabash College

THE CHILD'S BOOK OF SPEECH SOUNDS. By Sylvia Chipman. Magnolia, Massachusetts: Expression Co., 1954; pp. 43. $1.25.

The colorful cover of this paper-backed booklet of children's rhymes furnishes an attractive invitation to the amusing illustrations and jingles within, which stimulate practice on each of the forty-three speech sounds presented. This book, primarily intended for the child's use, seems to offer material that is too advanced for the age group to which it is directed.

Although the trained clinician will be able to select suitable material for correction purposes, inconsistencies in the use of certain sounds and a slanting of other sounds to a particular region have a tendency to destroy the over-all effectiveness of the book. The scope of the book's usefulness would have been enhanced by a more careful choice of key words to illustrate the particular sounds and additional explanatory notes to aid the untrained parent.

The reviewer does not feel that this booklet "makes a valuable contribution to the field of speech correction . . . ," but it does serve a purpose in presenting amusing jingles with loaded key sounds for the smaller child to repeat after a teacher, parent, or clinician. The book seems more beneficial in stimulating continued use of correctly acquired sounds than it does in presenting material that offers ". . . a fresh approach to the techniques of correcting speech defects of children."

ROSEMARY BERNARD,
Ohio University

RHETORIC AT ROME: A HISTORICAL SURVEY. By M. L. Clarke. London: Cohen and West Ltd., 1953; pp. 203. 21s.

So artificial was the practice of Roman rhetoric that at one time an orator would even hire an audience to applaud him. Small wonder Professor Clarke finds little to extoll in Roman rhetorical education with its undue attention to artistic elegance. Indeed, his concluding jab that "Rhetoric is well enough, if kept within limits," should win agreeable response, however he may pique his American audience with his implied definition of rhetoric as merely a set of rules, or the statement that "Greek . . . in rhetoric has led to nothing."

Starting with the beginnings of rhetoric in Sicily, Clarke describes the impact of Greek rhetorical theory upon Roman culture and education. He treats in fifteen chapters the early Greek roots, the study of rhetoric during the days of the Republic, Ciceronian rhetoric, declamation, Quintilian, and in concluding sections, rhetoric during the Second Sophistic, and its impact upon Christian theologians. The author's cast of characters ranges from Cato to Cassiodorous, and he sweeps through some 700 years of classical history, but a good portion of Clarke's book deals with an able discussion of Cicero.

His main thesis is undeniable: that rhetoric in Roman schools became a false and frivolous thing when it failed to mend the breach between rhetoric and philosophy; further, that the unreal exercises of the schoolroom, the *suasoriae* and the *controversiae* became quite divorced from the useful practice of the real world.

An illustration of the latter is found in Clarke's recital of the names of those declaimers who were popular before the crowded classrooms, but who were wretchedly inept at defending a case in court. Actually, the rhetorical minutiae of the Greek schoolmasters were not of great help to practicing Roman orators.

It has been generally acknowledged that a broad educational background did fit outstanding speakers for the Roman bar, but Clarke claims that even Cicero's speech construction is due less to schooling, more to "practices of the Roman courts, the exigencies of debate and the immediate political situation." For example, Greek court practice required witnesses to speak first; Roman practice (until Pompey's time), last. Hence, Greek forensics dealt with fact and substance; Roman speeches turned to wit, emotion, and personal appeal.

Structured around personalities rather than topical concepts, the book is a compressed and heavily-footnoted volume and makes for stiff reading. But the sum total is a valuable work for graduate students and instructors.

KENNETH W. PAULI,
Stanford University

HUGH ROY CULLEN: A STORY OF AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY. By Ed Kilman and Theon Wright. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954; pp. viii+376. $4.00.

The life of Hugh Roy Cullen, as told by Messrs. Kilman and Wright, is actually divided into two periods, one of building wealth and the other of disposing of it. After quitting school in the fifth grade, Cullen became a cotton broker, then a real estate man in Houston and finally an oil driller. He was to become known as the "King of the Wildcatters," and, indeed, he deserved the title. He found oil where other companies had refused to gamble, and developed areas which had before been abandoned. The Cullen-devised system of "creekology" proved to be more exacting than the geologists with all of their technical apparatus. By the mid-point in Roy Cullen's life, he had evolved from an almost penniless youth to the possessor of a vast fortune in oil. It is another "rags to riches" story which could happen only in the United States.

More inspiring than his rapid accumulation of monetary riches is his method of disposing of them. His philosophy of philanthropy is different from those of most millionaires. He discerned that it would be more beneficial to use his wealth where and when it would do the most good, and at the same time, give pleasure to the donors while they were still living. To this end, Roy and Lillie Cullen have given away ninety-three percent of their worldly goods. The bulk of the wealth has gone into the Cullen Foundation, with assets of $160,000,000 to be donated to worthy causes in Texas. In a single forty-eight hour period he gave over four-and-a-half million dollars in equal parts to four hospitals in Houston. He has been the benefactor of the University of Houston, and has helped develop church buildings and hospitals throughout the state.

A less inspiring, and more informative portion of the biography of Cullen is to be found in the latter chapters. The political influence which Cullen apparently possessed, and possesses, is revealed, and the bulk of the last half of the book is given to the political philosophy and activities of the Texas oilman, including

excerpts from letters and speeches. It offers a good insight into the manner in which men of wealth participate in political affairs. Roy Cullen, according to the biography, had a tremendous political acumen, and influenced, either directly or indirectly, the political fortunes of such men as Everett Dirksen, Harold Stassen, Robert Taft, and Dwight Eisenhower. He contributed large sums of financial support to Congressmen and Senators of both political parties who were opposed to the "creeping socialism" policies of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Although the authors have been excessively repetitious at times, the biography of Hugh Roy Cullen makes interesting reading, and points to an anomalous personality. The philanthropist is without bias when giving money to charitable organizations, so long as they are in Texas; and without bias in giving financial aid to members of both political parties, so long as they support anti-internationalist, high tariff legislation. The biography is an inspirational volume for all who read it, and those interested in the political maneuvering of Texas oilmen, through correspondence, speeches and donations, will find this work even more absorbing.

ROBERT C. JEFFREY,
University of Virginia

MASTERS OF THE DRAMA. By John Gassner. (Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged). New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1954: pp. xxii+890. $5.95.

Following close upon the publication of the exciting collection of his periodical essays in *The Theatre in Our Times*, appears the third "revised and enlarged" edition of the excellent and indefatigable John Gassner's indispensable *Masters of the Drama*, which, upon its original appearance in 1940 immediately established itself as a unique one-volume encyclopedically complete and completely satisfying history of world theatre and drama. To the 1945 edition was added a brief "Supplement, 1940-1945: The Terrible Interim." The preface to the present revision is dated October, 1951, but the final chapter, "Midcentury Summary," refers to plays presented on Broadway as recently as 1953.

"The main feature of the present edition," writes Gassner, "is Chapter XXXI, an extensive essay on playwrights who either won recognition or increased their international reputation after 1940." This chapter of 56 pages is divided into twelve sections. A short general introduction is followed by brief analyses of the work first of Lorca and then of Brecht and Zuckmayer. Five sections are devoted to French theatre and drama, since Gassner understandably believes midcentury French drama has proved "the most stimulating in the world." The work of Jouvet and Barrault as producers, the revived interest in and production of Claudel's plays, the eccentric brain-creatures of Giraudoux and Anouilh, are compactly but competently assessed; the longest, most hitherto desiderated, and finely analytical section deals with Sartre and the existentialists; and an equally valuable and, for the American reader, informative consideration of the work of Henry de Montherlant closes the French studies. Two sections, one considering such British playwrights as Priestley, Bridie, Shaw, and O'Casey, the other more at length approaching the problems of Eliot and Fry, account for the English post-war theatre. The chapter closes with two sections on American theatre and drama, the first rapidly glancing at the development of musical drama from Rodgers and Hammerstein to Menotti and the work in the last dozen years of the veterans Barry, Anderson, O'Neill, Hellman, and Kingsley, and a handful of newcomers, and the second giving probably Gassner's most considered appraisal of those rapidly aging if not maturing *enfants terribles*, Miller and Williams.

This new chapter is a sheer *tour de force* in Gassner's best manner, combining encyclopedic and multilingual familiarity with all of contemporary drama with exquisite poise of judgment and distinction of style. The photograph section on theatre from classic to modern times has been revised and a new nine-page textual commentary added; two new sections of photographs, one of twenty-four dramatists from Aeschylus to Arthur Miller, the other an Album of Modern Stage Productions from *Ghosts* to *Member of the Wedding* appear; and the valuable table, Theatre and Man in the Western World, the bibliographies, and the indices have been brought up to date.

Since 1940, *Masters of the Drama* has proved its worth as the book of largest compass in its field, recommendable to the layman and scholar alike. It was challenged in 1950 by Allardyce Nicoll's *World Drama: From Aeschylus to Anouilh*. But fine as Nicoll's book is as an academic survey, Gassner's remains indisputably wider in scope so far as philosophic range, sane and balanced socio-economico-politico insight and understanding, unerring critical tact, taste, and judgment, and general stylistic charm are concerned.

E. J. WEST,
University of Colorado

THE TRAGEDIES OF GEORGE CHAPMAN: RENAISSANCE ETHICS IN ACTION. By Ennis Rees. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954; pp. 235. $4.50.

Possibly the chief accomplishment of this survey of six tragedies by Chapman is the thoughtful reassessment of this poet's tragic heroes, in terms of his "Christian humanism." As the subtitle of his book indicates, Rees is champion of the Renaissance ethic, not of its public stage. The student of seventeenth-century English drama will surely profit from the chapters Ennis Rees has penned; but he should not look to *The Tragedies of George Chapman* for enlightenment concerning Chapman's achievement as playwright. One must concede the conviction and authority with which the author treats the ethical foundation of the plays he has selected for study; nevertheless, one misses here the true cornerstone of Renaissance drama—"two boards and a passion."

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
University of California, Berkeley

EDWARD ARLINGTON ROBINSON: THE LITERARY BACKGROUND OF A TRADITIONAL POET. By Edwin S. Fussell. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954; pp. 221. $3.50.

"Qui pourraise-je imiter pour être original?" On this question Mr. Fussell hangs his scholarly and painstaking study of the literary influences—American, English and classical—affecting the poetic work of Edward Arlington Robinson. Central to Mr. Fussell's thesis is the notion that Robinson—like Eliot and other tradition-minded poets that came after him—realized his dependence on and consciously tried to exploit for his own purposes the literary heritage to which he succeeded.

In demonstrating Robinson's debt to his precursors, Fussell is at his best and most convincing when the evidence he adduces is drawn from Robinson's critical writings, his letters, and recorded sayings. Robinson's expressions of literary opinion were numerous and interesting. An excellent and ordered sampling thereof is furnished in the present study.

In demonstrating the influence which earlier writers exerted over Robinson's poetry, however, Mr. Fussell's efforts achieve a somewhat circumscribed success. And within this area he is better at showing similarity of idea and attitude than at showing inspiration for form, poetic diction, or poetics.

Perhaps the broad and comprehensive scope of the present work is, at bottom, responsible for its failings. The author, clearly, has sacrificed intensive cultivation for broad coverage when he tries to relate Robinson and his works to the whole of the literary tradition, both American and English, both modern and classical. It is no wonder that such a study when compressed into less than two hundred pages can supply us with no deep-searching penetration into any one of Robinson's poems. This is no second *Road to Xanadu*. The author has travelled far in no direction; his purpose seems rather to have been "to leave no stone unturned."

ROBERT H. SPROAT,
Boston University

THE MODERN IRISH WRITERS: Cross Currents of Criticism. By Estella Ruth Taylor. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1954; pp. 176. $3.50.

This book is about the writers of the Irish renaissance—Yeats, A. E. Moore, Lady Gregory, Joyce, and their associates. The object of the study is to show that despite their individual differences of character and opinion these writers were bound together by a common cause—the establishment of a national literature of Ireland. Miss Taylor reviews the results of their achievement, the fruits of their collaborations, and the mutual influences they exerted over each other.

Among the several chapters in Miss Taylor's study, perhaps the most amusing, though not the most instructive, is one devoted to describing how members of this group thought about each other. For example, Yeats hailed Synge as a modern Aeschylus; Joyce was commonly referred to as a Dublin Dante; and George Moore suggested parallels between A.E. and Christ.

Miss Taylor is primarily concerned with reporting facts about these Irish authors. She reviews their efforts, apparently abortive, to define the Irish mind and character, to establish Gaelic as the language of literature, to define precisely their attitude toward the English literary tradition. Whatever the success of these achievements, it must be remembered that they did produce the Abbey Theatre—and, it should be noted, they also fulfilled their aim of making literary history, as this study makes so abundantly clear.

ROBERT H. SPROAT,
Boston University

THE ANGLICAN PULPIT TODAY: REPRESENTATIVE SERMONS BY LEADING PREACHERS OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. Edited by Frank D. Gifford. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1953; pp. 235. $3.50.

The Anglican Pulpit Today is a collection of sermons by leading preachers of the Anglican Communion. This collection is a vital answer to the oft-heard criticism that good preaching is not to be found generally in the Episcopal Church.

In these sermons there is unity, but not uniformity. The preachers seem to find their rallying point around the Doctrine of the Church, the Book of Common Prayer, or the historic creeds. Yet from these foundations there is a myriad of differences in approach and application.

There is also a universality here which is heartening. The representative preachers in this book come from all over the world, yet the messages are neither provincial nor national. The fact that the testimonies of these preachers come from such diverse areas will hearten the reader.

The list of contributors reads like a "Who's Who" in the Anglican Church. Here one will find sermons by such preachers as the Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore P. Ferris, Austin Pardue, Henry K. Sherrill, Samuel Shoemaker, and Theodore Wedel.

The criticism to be raised is mild indeed. On the one hand, we can thank these brethren for their emphasis upon the doctrines of Christendom. Yet, on the other hand, it might be well to point out that many of the sermons fail at the point of persuasion. Few of them have adequate concern with introductions or illustrations. Perhaps set in the ritualistic worship of this communion, a concern for audience-adaptation is not necessary. Yet, rhetorically, the sermon should be a unity within itself, able to carry its own weight.

A sermon cannot be printed and still be the sermon as preached, yet the thoughtful reader will find this book of sermons a rewarding stimulus both intellectually and spiritually.

RONALD E. SLEETH,
Garrett Biblical Institute

THE PROCESS AND EFFECTS OF MASS COMMUNICATION. Edited by Wilbur Schramm. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1954; pp. x+586. $6.00.

Forty articles, six introductory notes and an essay of general introduction by the editor provide the substance of this volume. Social psychology of human masses is the central subject, and international communication through mass media is the main application of that subject. Selections date from years before World War II (Cantril's "The Invasion from Mars," 1940), from the war years (Hertzog's "Motivations and Gratifications of Daily Serial Listeners," 1944), and from the years following World War II (Lasswell's "The Strategy of Soviet Propaganda," 1951). Included are some statements of sociological theory such as Krech and Crutchfield's "Perceiving the World" and Blumer's "The Crowd, the Public, and the Mass." A well-chosen list of one hundred titles for further reading is provided, along with an index of names and subjects.

The college teacher who wishes to choose a book of readings for the use of a class may select from several offerings in this field. Because *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* may be more to his liking than similar volumes, he could salute the soundness of his judgment by skimming through this book before he makes his choice. Klapper's keen summary of the effects of mass media, for example, is to be read only here or where there are some now-dear copies of the mimeographed book in which it was first issued. And true to its norm the University of Illinois Press has manufactured a handsome product. The binding is durable and the type is clear, but some of the ideas inside the binding are not easy to grasp because they are plain on the page. Much of the substance is for the man who has benefited from a course in psychology and has studied recent world history. This kind of man is probably an upperclassman or a graduate whose special studies are in communication, advertising, education, or some similar subject. If he buys the book to use it as a text, he can be expected to keep it as a general reference.

KENNETH HARWOOD,
University of Southern California

THE MENTAL HOSPITAL. By Alfred H. Stanton and Morris S. Schwartz. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1954; pp. vii+484. $7.50.

The findings from this three-year study made by a psychiatrist (from Boston Veterans Administration Hospital) and a sociologist (from Washington Schools of Psychiatry) seem almost dramatic for those concerned with the improvement of the communication and human relations in their enterprises. The study makes probably the most thorough investigation thus far available of the interpersonal factors in the

organization and operation of an institution. In no situation is communication more crucial and critical to the effectiveness and welfare of all human beings concerned than in such an enterprise as the subject of this study—namely, a large veterans mental hospital.

"When a seriously disturbed patient feels or says for the first time that a staff member understands him, it marks an emotional landmark; staff member and patient both begin to hope, and to feel that solid realistic grounds for hope exist. Conversely when a patient is not understood, it often means bleak despair. . . . No single word used at the hospital is more charged with emotional meaning, or more slippery in cognitive implications, than the word 'understanding.'" "The most satisfactory communication results in consensus. There is both delight and security when consensus is achieved and reaches consciousness. The security which accompanies a consensus is so precious that both parties tend to maintain it at the expense of their critical abilities." "It often, very often in the mental hospital, seems more promising to maintain a consensus than to think. A consensus, an agreement, and a misunderstanding may be non-verbal as well as verbal either with those patients overly prone to make inferences or with the staff."

Patients were quite incapable of recognizing and making the complicated corrections which go on where there is two-way communication and "genuine" interaction. Many misunderstandings, furthermore, are or seem to be self-confirming. The most common, most conspicuous and most clearly serious misunderstanding occurred when someone, staff member or patient, ignored the explicit meaning of a statement or action and focused attention on an inferred meaning. By the general semanticists this behavior is called over-definition by intension.

Many aspects of communication are treated in this book, some with insights which may be new to many teachers of speech. Only a few of the matters may be listed here; such as the formal organization of communication; the organization of oral communication; experimental alteration of prestige and reputation; constraints on communication; confidential communications; the relation between communication and power, decision-making breakdowns, role-taking and communication; the transmission of information and misinformation; nonverbal communication and its contagious effects in disturbed groups; the instability of groups with disturbed persons. With some modification the research structure utilized in this study may be of great value in other institutions and enterprises.

Although analogies with so-called normal groups must be made with the greatest care, yet no honest facing up to our problems can rule out the validity which they represent in this study. The reviewer thinks that the institution which subjected itself to such a thorough and scientific action research evaluation of its own functioning deserves more than a salute. The contribution made by these authors has our unusual respect.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver

STAGING TV PROGRAMS AND COMMERCIALS. By Robert J. Wade. New York: Hastings House, 1954; pp. xiii+216. $6.50.

Mr. Wade's new book is a most practical companion to his already valuable *Designing for TV* and his NBC manual *Operation Backstage*. Outstanding feature of this new text on the arts and crafts in television production is, in my opinion, the specific treatment of such TV topics as: specifications and ordering data for stage hardware, paint and lumber; list of suppliers of TV production facilities; extensive practical treatment of the problems of scenic design; construction and painting as they apply to TV. It is precisely this treatment of the arts and crafts as used in television which distinguishes this book from other works in the field of design and art direction.

Further handling of other production facilities areas such as graphic arts, costuming, and make-up round out a text which should supply a most urgent need, not only in the field of TV production training, but also for station and allied TV personnel.

My only area of diluted enthusiasm for Mr. Wade's book might be its occasional overlapping in content with his previous two works and the text's organization. However, as he states in his introduction: ". . . STAGING TV . . . was written on trains, in advertising agency reception offices and backstage during breaks in day-long technical and program rehearsals—in other words, under the pressures of TV network production and its complexities. And although roughing out notes with the hammering of stagehands, the complaints, "Hey, Bob, dis tree ain't got no jack," and the rhythm of Skitch Henderson's 30-piece orchestra as accompaniment may not lead to the composition of very good prose, the final results should not smack of ivory tower theorizing. . . ."

This is no ivory tower book. And if occa-

sionally the prose jogs to the rhythm of Mr. Henderson, it is perhaps this very flavor which is needed for the subject's full impact.

In a field noted for many "chiefs" and few "Indians," this book is a must for all, a text for students, a handy reference for professionals.

MILAN D. BARNES,
Boston University

BOOKS RECEIVED

DEFENSE AND NATIONAL SECURITY. Edited by Herbert L. Marx, Jr. The Reference Shelf, Volume 26, Number 6. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1954; pp. 192. $1.75.

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS: THE CONFLICT OF POWERS. Edited by Joan Coyne McLean. The Reference Shelf, Volume 27, Number 1. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1955; pp. 218. $2.00.

ARTICLES ON AMERICAN LITERATURE: 1900-1950. By Lewis G. Leary. Durham, North Carolina: The Duke University Press, 1954; pp. 452. $7.50.

TEACHERS OF HISTORY: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF LAURENCE BRADFORD PACKARD. Edited by Henry Stuart Hughes. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1954; pp. 378. $5.00.

HOW TO PROVE A PRIMA FACIE CASE. By Howard Hilton Spellman. (Third edition). New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954; pp. 714. $8.50.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE GREAT EDUCATORS. By Robert R. Rusk. (Revised and Enlarged). New York: St. Martin's Press, 1954; pp. 311. $2.75.

THE COLLECTED POEMS OF EDITH SITWELL. By Edith Sitwell. New York: Vanguard Press, 1954; pp. 492. $6.50.

CLEVER INTRODUCTIONS FOR CHAIRMEN: A COMPILATION OF SPEECHES AND STORIES. By Lawrence M. Brings. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison Co., 1954; pp. 416. $4.50.

EIGHTY-ONE SPEECHES FOR FORTY-FOUR OCCASIONS. By James V. Jacobs. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1954; pp. 256. $3.00.

SPEAKERS ARE LEADERS. By Nathaniel E. Reed. Boonton, New Jersey: Leadership Publications, 1954; pp. 178. $3.00.

THE EXCELLENCE OF OUR CALLING: AN ABRIDGMENT OF PHILLIPS BROOKS' 'LECTURES ON PREACHING.' By Thomas F. Chilcote, Jr. New York: E. P. Dutton Company, 1954; pp. 192. $2.75.

THE LIFE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN: A SHORT, ILLUSTRATED BIOGRAPHY. By Stefan Lorant. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1954; pp. 256. $3.50.

LIVING AMERICAN PLAYS. Edited by Felix Sper. New York: The Globe Book Co., 1954; pp. vi+451. $3.00.

COLLECTED POEMS: NEW REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION. By James Stephens. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. xi+363. $5.00.

HUMANITIES. By Desmond MacCarthy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954; pp. xii+222.

FAVORITE MODERN PLAYS. Selected and edited by Felix Sper. New York: Globe Book Company, 1953; pp. ix+530. $3.00.

THE CIVILIZATION OF THE RENAISSANCE IN ITALY. By Jacob Burckhardt, with an Introduction by Hajo Holborn. New York: The Modern Library, 1954; pp. xi+424. $1.45.

LINCOLN AND DOUGLAS: THE YEARS OF DECISION. By Regina Zimmerman Kelly. New York: Random House, 1954; pp. 184. $1.50.

SHAKESPEARE MEMORIAL THEATRE, 1951-1953: A PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD. With a Critical Analysis by Ivor Brown. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1954. $5.00.

LIGHT ARMOUR: PLAYFUL POEMS ON PRACTICALLY EVERYTHING. By Richard W. Armour. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1954; pp. 131. $2.75.

SHORT PLAYS FOR ALL-BOY CASTS. By Vernon Howard. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1954; pp. 186. $3.00.

SECONDARY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES. By Frederick C. Gruber and Thomas Bayard Beatty. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1954; pp. xii+292. $4.50.

view, and appear as talent. In addition they direct, switch, floor direct and operate the cameras.

The five student-produced Television Laboratory programs broadcast by WOI-TV each week include: "A Word to the Wives," a home economics program; "This is Iowa State," a public relations program; "Handy Man," an industrial education program; "Best Buys," a home economics program with special emphasis on food; and "Everyday Engineering," an everyday technology program designed for the home owner.

JUNE 13-18, 1955, marks the date for the annual speech workshop on the Bradley campus. This workshop, conducted for the elementary school teachers, speech correctionists, and parents of children with speech problems, is under the direction of Clara K. Mawhinney with Bernice Tuell as supervisor.

Visiting professors will be Harley A. Smith, Director of Southwest Louisiana Special Education, and Donald Koller, Chairman of Speech Correction, Galesburg Public Schools.

The theme of the week will be "Learning to Understand the Teamwork Behind a Successful Speech Correction Program." There will be opportunity for observation of speech specialists working with speech cases; participation of teachers and correctionists in working with children in diagnosis and therapy; and discussion of carry-over of speech improvement to classroom subjects.

The Fifth Invitational Speech Festival for high schools will be held April 23. Events included are radio news-casting, original oratory, extemporaneous speaking, story telling, debate, and discussion.

THE LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE Forensics Society on March 12 became the California Lambda chapter of Pi Kappa Delta. Seventeen students and two faculty advisers make up the charter members. The forensics program at Los Angeles State has been growing steadily since the college was opened in 1947. This year some thirty people will have participated in intercollegiate contests before the year is over.

THE FORENSIC PROGRAM at the University of Washington during 1954-55 includes appearances of student panels before community audiences in the state, in addition to an extensive program of inter-collegiate participation. The questions discussed before community audiences are "How can the American educational system best meet the needs of our society?" and "What should be the foreign policy of the United States in the Far East?" Intercollegiate activities for the year include attendance at seven or eight meets of various types, including the Montana TKA tournament, the Annual Conference of the Pacific Forensic League, and the Western Regional Delta Sigma Rho Congress. Gale Richards is director of the forensic activity.

PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS for the Bradley chapter of Sigma Alpha Eta this year have included lectures by Mrs. John Malkow, Occupational Therapist, Crippled Children Center, Peoria, who spoke on "An Occupational Therapist Looks on Speech Correction"; Dr. Robert Hart, M. D., Peoria, whose topic was "A Doctor Looks Toward Speech Therapy"; and Ray Graham, Director of Special Education State of Illinois, who spoke on "An Administrator Looks Toward Speech Therapy." Dr. Joseph N. Schaeffer, Associate Medical Director of the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Methodist Hospital, and his staff gave a demonstration of physical therapy for the February meeting; and Miss Miles of the Mental Hygiene Clinic, talked on "A Psychologist Looks at Speech Correction" for the April meeting.

THE SPEECH AND HEARING CENTER at Adelphi College is conducting its second summer workshop in speech pathology. The workshop theme is "Learning Theory, Language and Speech Pathology." The program emphasizes a theory of learning based on clinical research and experimentation and applies the theoretical data to problems of stuttering, aphasia and delayed speech.

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE Speech Department has announced the first Apple Blossom Oral Interpretation Festival which will take place May 25, 26, and 27, 1955.

Any college student may read in as many as six kinds of reading events: poetry, drama, serious prose, humorous prose, a speech, and newscasts.

Poetry, drama and prose are limited to ten minute prepared cuttings from authors suggested in the detailed material available upon request to Moiree Compere, at Michigan State College.

One of the outstanding events is the Reading Theatre program to be given by a nationally known reader and actor, Albert Dekker, who will read masterpieces of literature. He will appear at Fairchild Theatre on May 26.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE has had a busy year in speech and debate. The University Extension Service sponsored novice and experienced debate as well as speech events tournaments for the high schools in the state of New Hampshire. Directing the tournaments was Edward D. Shanken, assistant director of the University Extension Service and president of the New Hampshire Speech Association.

The University is also playing host to the annual New England National Forensic League tournament held on March 4 and 5.

MAUD MAY BABCOCK died December 31, 1954.

She was one of the truly great women of the West. She was born in East Worcester, New York, May 2, 1867, and was educated in the East, receiving a Bachelor of Elocution degree from the National School of Oratory in Philadelphia in 1886, graduating from the Lyceum School of Acting in New York in 1888, and studying and teaching at Harvard in the summers of 1891, 1892, and 1893. Susan Young Yates (a daughter of Brigham Young) was Miss Babcock's student during the summer of 1892 and was responsible for her taking "a fling at the West" in the following September. The West became her home—spiritually, as well as geographically; to it she gave her loyalty; of it she became an integral part.

During that first year in Utah, 1892-3, she taught elocution and physical culture at the University of Utah in the morning and at the Brigham Young Academy in the afternoon. Her name did not appear in the University of Utah catalogue until the 1893-94 issue, when she was listed as instructor in elocution and physical culture. In 1896-97 she was director of gymnasium and instructor of reading, elocution, and physical culture; in 1897-98, assistant professor of elocution and physical culture and director of gymnasium. By 1903-04 she was associate professor of elocution and director of women's gymnasium, and in 1904-05 she was full professor of elocution—and indeed was the Department of Elocution. In 1919, the Department of Elocution, with an increasing staff, became the Department of Public Speaking. (Miss Babcock had become Professor of Public Speaking in 1917.) In 1927, her department became the Department of Speech, and she was its chairman until her retirement in 1938, when the University of Utah conferred upon her an honorary doctorate.

The University of Utah theatre came into being when the University of Utah Dramatic Club organized by Miss Babcock, presented *Eleusinia* under her direction. During the following forty-five years (Miss Babcock directed a number of productions after her official retirement) she personally produced more than 300 plays.

She was a charter member of the National Association of Elocutionists (1892-1917), and a charter member of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, of which she became president in 1936. She was National President of Theta Alpha Phi, Honorary Dramatic Fraternity, from 1920 to 1922. She personally installed chapters of this society at the University of Utah, University of Hawaii, and Brigham Young University. She founded the Lucy Mack Home for Girls; for 22 years she served on the Board of Directors of the Utah School for the Deaf and Blind; and she was instrumental in establishing the Latter Day Saint Deseret Gymnasium in Salt Lake City.

In 1913, the University of Utah Dramatic Club presented *Mrs. Bumpstead Leigh*. Twenty-three years later in 1936, the same cast, with a single exception, again presented the same play under Miss Babcock's direction. Even Miss Babcock's "assistant" and "stage manager" were the same: the former, Judge Herbert Schiller, and the latter, Bishop Duane G. Hunt of the Utah Catholic Diocese.

The cast included Attorneys Henry Ruggeri and Vernon Snyder, Dr. J. Albert Peterson, Judge Allen G. Thurman, Utah Attorney General Grover Giles, and the Governor of Utah, Dr. Herbert B. Maw. Edith Barlow Menser came from Chicago and two other members came from out of town to participate. The production was a monumental tribute to Maud May Babcock. The sacrifice of precious and all-too-scant leisure time by eminent folk in positions of public responsibility indicates the respect, the loyalty, the love which hundreds of men and women hold for a teacher who enriched their lives deeply and indelibly.

Here was a teacher not only dedicated to her profession and to her chosen academic areas, but dedicated also to the proposition that the only true and unfailing practicality is unswerving rectitude. Here was a teacher whose practice invariably exemplified her precept; whose home was perpetually a gathering place for students—present and alumni. Only those who have partaken of her inspiration can appreciate what her students mean when we speak of "Miss B."

Thousands of students have sat and are sitting under Babcock-trained teachers—students into the fourth generation—who are better hu-

man beings because Maud May Babcock lived. God grant that more of us can attain comparable immortality.

—Joseph F. Smith

THE FIFTH ANNUAL Television Workshop is scheduled August 1-19 at Michigan State College for persons desiring brief but intensive training in television programming, production and station management. Robert P. Crawford, assistant professor of speech and director of radio-TV education at M.S.C., writes that the workshop will meet the interests and needs of those who expect to be engaged in the planning and preparation of public service or educational TV programs on either commercial or non-commercial stations.

The staff will include Armand L. Hunter, director of WKAR-TV, management; Dr. Crawford, programming; and William Tomlinson, television coordinator and producer at WKAR-TV, production. The staff also will include others from the Department of Speech and WKAR-TV when needed for special services.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA Department of Speech and Theatre Arts and the University High School are sponsoring a dual workshop in Theater and in Speech Activities for high school students, to be held the first summer session, June 13 to July 16. A maximum of thirty students will be enrolled in each division. Classes will meet in the new University High School building where wired television facilities are available. The special course is taught for high school credit, and is designed especially for high school sophomores and juniors who will take the results of their training back to their home town high schools for use the following school year.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH AND THEATRE ARTS at Minnesota is featuring extended work in audiology this coming summer. During the first session Frank Lassman of the staff will teach "Hearing Disorders" and "Clinical Practice in Audiology." During the second summer term, July 18 to August 20, a visiting professor will offer courses in "Language Training for the Deaf" and "Auditory Training." During the week following the second term an institute for parents of young deaf children will be held in the University of Minnesota Center for Continuation Study.

SOME OF THE participants at the biennial convention of the Catholic Theatre Conference to be held at the University of Notre Dame, June 13-16, are Emmet Lavery, playwright and critic; Maureen Mitchell, Northwestern University, costume demonstration; Thelma George, lectures and demonstration; Mirian D. Gow, choric drama; and Helene Oostubeeck. Productions by university, community, and high school groups will be presented and discussed.

THE TULANE Speech and Hearing Center has initiated a lecture-discussion series based on the problems and interests of parents of young deaf children. The first program in the series featured a talk on "Causes of Deafness in Young Children," by Dr. James W. McLaurin, chairman of the Department of Otolaryngology of Tulane University School of Medicine. Prior to the talk, the film "The Ears and Hearing" was shown. The second program was presented on "Accepting the Deaf Child." The speaker was Dr. Irwin Marcus, child psychiatrist, and Director of the Family Study Unit. The third program will be concerned with "Normal Development of the Young Child," and will be presented by Dr. D. W. Van Gelder, assistant professor of pediatrics. The series is aimed at parents and those interested in helping young deaf children.

THE SUMMER TELEVISION and film institute scheduled for Miami, Fla., in July is the result of long-standing cooperation between a commercial TV station and a university. The University of Miami and Station WTVJ, Miami, are jointly sponsoring the institute. Reela Films, Inc., the motion picture producing subsidiary of WTVJ, is the collaborator on film work. Emphasis will be on practical production of live TV programs and films for television.

Sydney W. Head, chairman of the University of Miami department, will plan and supervise the whole institute. O. P. Kidder, Jr., the department's TV director, will supervise live production; and the film production section will be supervised by C. Henderson Beal, the department's film director. A leaflet of details and answers to specific questions can be obtained from Dr. Head.

THE STANFORD UNIVERSITY Speech and Hearing Clinic has prepared a mimeographed brochure describing career opportunities in the fields of speech correction and hearing. Free copies may be obtained by writing the director, Virgil A. Anderson.

FRANKLIN DUNHAM, Chief of Radio and Television in the U. S. Office of Education, is to conduct a six-week workshop in educational

radio and television at the University of Southern California from June 20 through July 30. The workshop will use the fully-equipped air-conditioned radio and television studios of the Department of Telecommunications, according to Kenneth Harwood, department chairman, and will take advantage of the nearby location of many facilities in Hollywood. Both the workshop and the course in programming yield university credits to undergraduate students and graduate students.

THE SPEECH DEPARTMENT of the Pennsylvania State University will hold its Seventh Annual Pennsylvania Interpretative Reading Festival April 28 and 29. Invitations have been extended to 80 colleges throughout the Commonwealth, each of which may send as many as three student representatives.

On the first day of the Festival the reading program will be devoted to the interpretation of various types of poetry. In the evening all of the Festival participants, including the faculty sponsors, the student readers, and other students representing the various colleges, will join in the traditional banquet. John Henry Frizzell, professor emeritus and former head of the Penn State Speech Department, will be the after-dinner speaker.

During the second day, the morning session will be given over to the reading of prose, while the afternoon program will conclude the Festival with the reading of drama.

The Festival is under the direction of Harriett Nesbitt and William Hamilton of the Penn State Speech Department.

ON FEBRUARY 22 the Pennsylvania State University, located in the borough of State College, formally dedicated its own post office: University Park, Pennsylvania.

Since the institution became a university in 1953, it was becoming increasingly evident that the confusion between the new name of the school and the name of the borough was operating to the detriment of the school. A referendum to change the name of the borough was defeated in the 1954 elections. The Board of Trustees thereupon acted to obtain a separate post office for the university.

UNDER THE AUSPICES of the speech department at Brooklyn and the Division of Community Services, Mel White, director, a program of readings has been inaugurated in George Gershwin Theatre. Elizabeth P. Casey of the department opened with a reading of Synge's *Riders to the Sea*. Other readers include Bonnie Hawthorne, "Women on Love;" Louis B. Mallory, Dickens' *Christmas Carol;* and Professor and Mrs. Paul B. Williams, Scenes from *Elizabeth the Queen*. Helen Roach directed a faculty reading of *The Second Shepherd's Play*. A student recital, readings by faculty members of the English Department and a program of scenes from Shakespeare are also included in the years project.

THE BROOKLYN COLLEGE debate council activities this year have included an invitation debate with the Oxford team which filled to overflowing the first debate in the newly-opened George Gershwin Hall. Brooklyn debaters have also met Cornell, and have also participated in tournaments at Tufts College, Temple University, New York University, and the University of Vermont.

On March 11 and 12 Brooklyn College was host to nearly seventy colleges with its eighth annual tournament on the national topic. Harland Cleveland, editor of *Reporter*, was the main speaker at the tournament dinner. The tournament, originated by Orvin Larson, now chairman of the Department at Brooklyn, has been under the supervision of Joanna Mogdelis for the past three years and is this year being directed by William Behl.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH at the University of Michigan was host on December 4 to 150 members of Junior Chamber of Commerce groups for a one-day leadership training conference. Members of the speech department conducted sessions on parliamentary procedure, public speaking, conference leadership, and participating in radio and television programs.

NATIONAL ATTENTION is being given the forthcoming Centennial Symposium on General Education of the Basic College of Michigan State College, April 25, 26 and 27, in the Kellogg Center, East Lansing, Michigan. Prominent figures in general education, business, and in law, medicine and engineering have prominent part in the three-day symposium, marking Michigan State College's one-hundredth year.

Area Interest speakers in Communication Skills are scheduled to include Irving J. Lee, professor and chairman, department of public speaking, School of Speech, Northwestern University; Max Fuller, president, Central States Speech Association; Cyril F. Hager, educational adviser, Air University and Air War College, Maxwell Field, Alabama; Ralph C. Leyden, chairman, division of Communications, Ste-

phens College; and W. S. Howell, editor of *QJS*.

ON JANUARY 15, in the Lydia Mendelssohn Theatre at the University of Michigan, Sister Mary Marguerite Butler, R.S.M., presented *Sapientia* and *Dulcitius*, by Hroswitha, tenth century German Benedictine nun. These dramas were staged in conjunction with Sister Mary Marguerite's doctoral dissertation concerning the staging possibilities of Hroswitha's plays. The question—whether the six Latin dramas of Hroswitha were actually performed in her convent during her lifetime—has puzzled and divided scholars for many years. According to audience reaction to the performances at Michigan, theatrical possibilities of these two dramas are good, even for twentieth century students of theatre history.

HOWARD COLLEGE DEBATERS are in the midst of a full season of debate activities. The squad has participated in three major intercollegiate tournaments, three contract meets, and has two remaining events on its schedule.

CHARLES B. MITCHELL, professor emeritus of speech at Oregon State College and for 32 years a staff member, died on January 11 of a heart condition in a hospital at Corvallis. He had retired as head of the department in 1952.

Professor Mitchell was born October 12, 1886, at Lebanon, Indiana. He received a bachelor's degree from DePauw in 1911 and a master's degree from Michigan in 1912. He taught at Michigan Agricultural College, now Michigan State College, from 1912 to 1920.

Going to Oregon State in 1920, Professor Mitchell established the department of speech, the first one in the Pacific Northwest and the second one on the Pacific coast, the only other one at that time being the University of Southern California at Los Angeles. He was director of the Oregon State debating team for several years, and was one of the first to send debate teams across the continent. He was also responsible for the first radio department in the Northwest and was instrumental in the development of the present college playhouse. He also established the first speech clinic in the Northwest.

ON APRIL 1 the Connecticut-New York region of the Children's Theatre Conference held a one-day Workshop at Teachers College, Columbia University. Included in the program were discussions and demonstrations of directing, acting, and costuming techniques, a play given by the Skidmore College group and a speech by Marc Connelly.

SHOP TALK'S MAIL contains a large number of bulletins and notes concerning summer workshops, clinics, and conferences.

Emerson College will take advanced drama courses and students to Martha's Vineyard to present a series of public productions of outstanding plays over a six-weeks' season.

The University of Oklahoma will hold a two-week institute for speech and drama students from July 18 to 29. For $90 a high school boy or girl can participate in debate, drama, radio, interpretation, and other aspects of speech, living in a University dormitory and eating at University dining halls.

A High School Debate Clinic is scheduled for the campus of Ohio University during the summer. Enrollees will study the fine points of debating and will work on the national question.

A series of two-week summer workshops is planned by the University of Oklahoma. The dates follow: June 20 to July 1, play production; June 20 to July 1, teaching speech in the secondary grades; July 5 to 15, teaching speech in the elementary grades; July 18 to 29, directing speech activities.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN College, formerly Central Michigan College of Education, has sponsored some unusual activities during the last year. Wilbur E. Moore, head of the department, presented a six-weeks' course for grade school teachers in speech correction, using TV and correspondence. Fifty-four teachers were enrolled. Last summer thirty-three persons enrolled for four hours credit to study drama in England for six weeks. The group attended theatre and opera in Paris, London, Stratford-on-Avon, Edinburgh, Belfast, Dublin, and Cork. Another project was a travel course to New York for two hours credit. The students had personal interviews with Katharine Cornell, Shirley Booth, Maurice Evans, Laurence Olivier, Vivien Leigh, and Henry Fonda. As an extracurricular activity, three of the students won $200 on the "Break the Bank" TV program. Fred Bush, director of dramatics at Central Michigan, is in charge of the travel courses. Still another activity of the department is the work of the radio division under Elbert Bowen, which last year originated 140 broadcasts from the departmental studio for WCEN.

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Conventions for the Speech Association of America are now scheduled as follows:

1955:	Hotel Statler, Los Angeles, December 28-30.
1956:	Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 27-29.
1957:	Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28.
1958:	Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 29-31.
1959:	Hotel Statler, Washington, December 28-30.
1960:	The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.
1961:	Hotel Statler, New York, December.
1962:	Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, December.

THE DRAMA AND SPEECH Department at Catawba College has nearly completed polling a distinguished group of figures in commercial and educational theatre to determine the thirty plays for a "Living Anthology." The thirty plays will make up a large part of the producing program of Catawba College for the next ten years.

Companion project with the "Living Anthology" is "The Contemporary Series." In this the department and The Blue Masque will present annually a new script by an unrecognized professional writer. The first production will be given to *Natural Son*, a two-act drama by David Shaber of Cleveland, Ohio.

ADD TO THE ORAL INTERPRETATION tape exchange, San Jose State College: "Love's Courage," a lecture recital on the Browning letters, read by Sara Lowrey, Furnam University; "A Nightmare Sequence," poems by Stephen Vincent Benét, read by Ruth Dougherty, student major in interpretation. Direct requests to L. H. Mouat at San Jose.

REFERRING TO THE explanation of dialectic in the February, 1954, Shop Talk, R. L. Mulder, director of the Western Oregon Cooperative Speech and Hearing Center writes this explanation of general semantics. "Several circles are presented one inside the other," he writes, "with the statement, 'General Semanticists talk round and round in circles and some circles are larger than others.'"

BROOKLYN'S NEW GEORGE GERSHWIN theatre will will be the scene April 28, 29, and 30 of a reading of *The Tempest*, as a part of the college's Shakespeare festival. Arnold Moss heads the presentation with a supporting cast of Equity players.

ENTRIES IN THE 13th Delaware Play Festival, scheduled for March 31 and April 1, reached the maximum permitted under the rules. Altogether there were 24 plays presented, four more than last year, and an all-time high. Marjorie Dyke of the New York City School of Performing Arts was critic judge. The Festival is a joint enterprise of the Delaware Dramatic Association and the University Dramatic Center, C. Robert Kase, Director. Herman Middleton is in charge of staging the productions.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE Oklahoma High School Speech League increased from 101 to 141 during the last two years. It jumped from 125 last year to 141 this year. Most of the increase has been in Class C schools, i.e., those with a total enrollment in grades nine to twelve of 150 and less.

Most of the district and conference tournaments have been held and those qualified will participate in the state finals to be held April 13-15 on the campus of the University of Oklahoma. Activities include one-act play, radio play, radio speaking for men, radio speaking for women, extempore speaking for men, extempore speaking for women, debate, discussion, analysis of public address, standard oratory, original oratory and oral interpretation of poetry, humorous literature and dramatic literature.

NOTES FROM MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE: Three student organizations—Sigma Alpha Eta (speech correction), Amethyst (dramatic club), and Phi Mu Gamma (debate)—have been active during the year. The Amethysts put on a theatre backstage party, featuring three one-act plays followed by dancing and games. The debate club during the first semester participated in thirty-two intercollegiate debates, meeting nineteen different colleges and universities. This club also held its annual "Extravaganza," an all-college social event.

Radio classes under the direction of Mary Elizabeth Kane are broadcasting bi-weekly from the campus studio. This year the theme of their plays is "Outstanding Women," selected particularly because of the College's observance of its silver jubilee.

Thomas A. Hopkins, chairman of the Department of Speech, served on a committee appointed to present recommendations to the

faculty for the teaching of the communications skills. As adopted by the faculty, the recommendations provide for the maintenance in all classes of a minimal standard of reading, listening, speaking and writing. Each instructor has assumed the responsibility for maintaining that minimum in the four areas, and all students having problems in those skills will be referred to the interested departments.

Barbara Bounds conducts clinic work for speech defective children in the Catholic schools of the Pittsburgh Diocese. Three senior clinicians are at present getting practical experience under supervision at the College Clinic and at nearby Catholic schools.

HIGHLIGHT of forensics activities at Ohio University this year is the 15th annual national Tau Kappa Alpha Conference to be held April 7, 8, and 9, 1955. Tau Kappa Chapters from all over the country will be represented at this affair. The Conference events include debate, discussion, public speaking and a student congress. L. C. Staats is director of the conference.

Luncheon and dinner speakers for the three day event include William C. Craig, head of the Department of Speech at Wooster College, and John Vorys, Representative from the 12th District, Ohio, to the House of Representatives.

RUTH M. CLARK, director of the Children's Speech Clinic, University of Denver, will be the keynote speaker of the annual spring conference workshop of the Michigan Speech Correction Association to be held May 13 and 14 at the Kellogg Center in East Lansing. Dr. Clark will speak Saturday morning "On Human Beings Being Human, or A Philosophy for Parents and Teachers of Speech Handicapped Children." On May 13 Dr. Clark, Harlan Bloomer, Doris Klaussen, Bruce Graham, Agnes Stokes, and Hildred Cross will comprise a panel to discuss "The Pre-School Child With a Speech or Hearing Problem."

Workshops May 14 will be on Hearing, The Interdependency of Specialists, Articulation, and Research, with Clifton Lawrence, Doris Klaussen, Prudence Brown, and Ann Thorne serving as the respective chairmen.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Adelphi College, Reader's Theatre: *Amphitryon 38, The Family Portrait, The Trojan Women, Measure for Measure, Elizabeth the Queen, The Glass Menagerie, In Noah's Ark, Ion, Andromache.*

Arkansas State College, College Theatre: *Angel Street, Winterset.*

Bradley University: *A Midsummer Night's Dream.*

Brooklyn College: *Sappho.*

Catawba College: *Huckleberry Finn* (original musical), *Antigone, Natural Son, Summer and Smoke, Hamlet, The School for Scandal.*

Teachers College, Columbia, University: *Hamlet.*

DePauw University: *Sabrina Fair, The Lute Song.*

Howard College: *Lady Windermere's Fan, The Twelve Pound Look, Mr. Sweeney's Conversion, The Imaginary Invalid, God's Trombones, Sabrina Fair.*

Los Angeles State College: *Antigone, Heaven Can Wait, Laura, American Portraits* (a dramatization of American poetry), *Detective Story, What Price Glory.*

Miami University: *The Taming of the Shrew, Arsenic and Old Lace.*

Ohio University Theatre: *Death of a Salesman, Kiss Me Kate, Joan of Lorraine, Bonds of Interest.* Summer theatre: *Mister Roberts, My Three Angels, Streetcar Named Desire, Mr. Barry's Etchings, Dial "M" for Murder, The Fifth Season, Curtain Calls.*

Queen's College: *Pygmalion, Mooney's Kid Don't Cry, The Pot Boiler, No Exit, Cantique de Cantique, Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves.*

University of Delaware: *Mrs. McThing.* Children's theatre: *Little Red Riding Hood.*

University of Maryland: *Pygmalion, Volpone, Finnian's Rainbow.*

University of Michigan: *Over the Teacups, Lord Byron's Love Letter, The Women, Hamlet, Dream Girl, Careless Wilderness, A Connecticut Comedy, The Foolish One, Falstaff.*

University of Pittsburg: *The Dancer, Yankee Blue, The Innocents, Dark of the Moon.*

Southern Methodist University: *A Scrap of Paper, Twelfth Night.*

Yale University: *The Sea Gull.*

APPOINTMENTS

Brooklyn College: Leland Watson, theatre.

Catawba College: Arnold Colbath, assistant professor of drama and speech, and associate director of the Blue Masque.

Johns Hopkins University: Alice H. Houstle, assistant director of the Playshop.

Los Angeles State College: Roger M. Altenberg, instructor in drama; J. T. Daniel, instructor in speech; Malcolm O. Sillars, instructor

in speech and director of forensics; Anthony Hillbruner, assistant professor of speech.

Miami University: Thomas B. Anderson, speech clinic.

Ohio University: Virginia Branson, Vause Smith, Bob Olson, graduate assistants in speech correction; Betty Grosh, Harold Steele, Andrew Stasik, Bill Brady, graduate assistants in theatre; Raymond Bedwell, Bernard Russi, graduate assistants in radio; Nancy Dean, graduate assistant in public address; Anthony Trisolini, instructor in dramatic art and speech; Archie Greer, acting director of radio and television; Gerald Beckwith, radio and television staff; Rosemary Bernard, director of the Children's Speech and Hearing Clinic.

Penn State University: Marian Brodbek McLeod, Edwin Lefkowith, instructors; Joan Llewellyn, Barbara Becker, graduate assistants.

Queens College: Frank Iezzi, instructor in speech; Constance Kuhn, Benjamin Kapen, tutors in speech; Norma Schneiderman, part-time tutor in speech; Sandra Goldberg, Constance Schroeder, fellows in speech; Beatrice Stocker, executive secretary, Queens Speech and Hearing center.

San Francisco Hearing and Speech Center: Daryle Waldron.

Stanford University: Mary Farquhar, acting assistant professor; Dorothy Adams, Robert Burkhalter, Joseph Chaiklin, Warren Dawson, Denny Dickenson, Frederick Garbee, Shirley Squiers, assistants in the Speech and Hearing Clinic.

Tulane University: Jean Branson, psychologist, Speech and Hearing Center.

University of Maryland: J. Allen Bowers, Donald Polzin, DeWitt White, instructors in speech.

University of Missouri: Summer session: Wilbur E. Gilman, visiting professor of speech.

University of Wisconsin: F. Craig Johnson, William E. Lisenby, Lois Sanders, teaching assistants. Summer session visiting lecturers and professors: Carroll C. Arnold, American public address; David W. Thompson, drama and interpretation; Edna E. Gilbert, pedagogy; Myfanwy Chapman, stuttering clinic; Vernon Smith, delayed speech clinic; Elizabeth Suliver, cleft palate clinic; Henry I. Okagaki, cerebral palsy clinic.

PROMOTIONS

Adelphi College: May Lou Plugge, professor of speech and dramatic art.

Brooklyn College: Joseph Davidson, assistant professor.

Los Angeles State College: James J. Stansell, associate professor of speech and head of the department of speech.

Queens College: Wilbur E. Gilman, professor of speech; David Guy Powers, associate professor of speech.

University of Chicago: Bess Sondel, professorial lecturer in communication.

PERSONAL NOTES

Kathryn Mulholland of Brooklyn will go to Japan and Hawaii on a sabbatical leave for 1955. . . . Catherine Myers will be on leave for the spring semester. . . . Joseph F. O'Brien is on leave of absence from Penn State for the spring semester to continue his biography of Henry Robert, parliamentarian. . . . Gertrude Slack, who held a first-semester appointment as instructor at DePauw, is now working toward her doctorate at Indiana University. . . . E. Christian Hamilton, Jr. has resumed teaching at DePauw after serving in the army. He will do some directing in the University theatre. . . . The annual Delta Sigma Rho tournament was held at DePauw on February 19, and was won by Wabash College.

Magdalene Kramer of Teachers College is on sabbatical leave during the spring semester. . . . Ronald C. Kern, assistant professor at Miami University, has been granted a two-year leave of absence to study toward the doctorate. He sails in September for study at the University of Bristol. . . . The Speakers Bureau at Miami, under the direction of Bernard F. Phelps, has drawn favorable comment from Cincinnati newspaper columnists; it has been called the best public relations medium of the university.

Victor E. Jacoby, assistant professor at Adelphi College, will take a sabbatical leave in the fall of 1955 to study scene and costume design in England. Professor Jacoby plans to leave this country in early July in time to participate in a summer workshop in Shakespearean Theatre at Stratford-on-Avon. . . . Jesse Beers, Jr., technical director of the Adelphi College Little Theatre, has had two of his scenic designs selected for exhibition at the City Centre in New York City.

Kenneth O. Johnson has been appointed Chief of Audiology and Speech Correction for the Veterans Administration in Washington, D. C. Prior to going to Washington, Dr. Johnson was director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at the Veterans Hospital in San Francisco and held a clinical appointment on the staff of the Department of Otolaryngology, University of California School of Medicine. . . .